ERYSICHTHON
A CALLIMACHEAN COMEDY

ERYSICHTHON
A CALLIMACHEAN COMEDY

PROEFSCHRIFT

TER VERKRIJGING VAN DE GRAAD VAN DOCTOR IN DE LETTEREN AAN DE RIJKSUNIVERSITEIT TE UTRECHT, OP GEZAG VAN DE RECTOR MAGNIFICUS, Dr. H. G. K. WESTENBRINK, HOOGLERAAR IN DE FACULTEIT DER GENEESKUNDE, VOLGENS BESLUIT VAN DE SENAAT DER UNIVERSITEIT IN HET OPENBAAR TE VERDEDIGEN OP WOENSDAG 20 JUNI 1962 DES NAMIDDAGS TE 3.15 UUR

DOOR

KENNETH JOHN MC KAY

GEBOREN TE SHEPPARTON (AUSTRALIE)

LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1962

PROMOTOR:

PROF. DR. W. J. VERDENIUS

Aan een gastvrij land

Uit grote dankbaarheid

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Part A: The Erysichthon Story Outside Kallimachos . . . 5

I. The Traditional Sources 5

II. Erysichthon and Mestra on Kos. 33

Part B: Kallimachos and Erysichthon 61

Basic Assumptions: 1. *The Complexity of H.* 6, p. 61. — 2. *Comedy and Motivation*, p. 63. — 3. *Piety and the Poet's Irony*, p. 65. — *General Motivation*, p. 69. — *The Scene of the Crime*, p. 72. — *The Poplar*, p. 78. — *The Time of Day*, p. 84. — *The Activity of the Nymphs*, p. 85. — *The Folly of Erysichthon*, p. 88. — *Callimachean Irony and Erysichthon the Giant*, p. 91. — *Demeter's Mistake and Kallimachos' Motivation of the Plot*, p. 98. — *The Punishment and Poetic Justice*, p. 101. — *Duality*, p. 104. — *The Prayer of Triopas*, p. 110. — *Further Examples of Duality*, p. 118. — *The End of the Story*, p. 125. — *The Sophisma of* 126-7, p. 129. — *H. 6 and Epicharmos*, p. 134. — *Conclusion: The Future of Studies in Mischief*, p. 136.

INTRODUCTION

This study of Kallimachos' Sixth Hymn is, through the poet's use of the story of Erysichthon, complete in itself. It was, however, impossible to examine it entirely in isolation, for I believe that Hymns 5 and 6 are companion pieces, and in a recent study of the former hymn ('The Poet at Play: Kallimachos, *The Bath of Pallas*' [1]) I have tried to defend this viewpoint. It needs to be mentioned briefly now, but borne in mind during the whole of the subsequent discussion. Hymn 5, I suggested, has turned out to be not nearly as shallow as our first impressions led us to believe. It is an attempt to explain away a savage tale, the Pherecydean version of the blinding of Teiresias, by making the humane Athene Oxyderkes the offended deity. At the same time Kallimachos has carefully, and mischievously, led us to expect that he will *praise* the deity by telling the story in its original, gruesome form— an expectation which must have astounded his first audience; to make this false belief the more inevitable he has presented Athene in a martial image and cast the whole composition in a plaintive form which I can only construe as Doric Threnodic Elegy. But no, he has found a means to pull the mat from under our feet, to justify Athene's action as *humane*; and should we complain that his piece is no longer a unity, he may gravely point to signposts in his opening stanzas to the very nature of the goddess which he has portrayed.

I have also provided in the same study an analysis of the ground-plan of the Sixth Hymn, for in the opening seventeen lines Kallimachos recreates the mood of H. 5, only to change course in a prearranged direction, and with equal attention to the unity of the composition, which seems in consequence to have been shattered. The time, he says, is no longer right for threnody; now it is comedy's turn. He therefore plays upon another mood of Doric, comedy, with, I think, Epicharmos as a formal model. If I am right, the poet has made it clear that these two hymns have a unified plan; we are therefore entitled to expect to find in the orientation of the Erysichthon story the dexterity which is now evident in his treatment of Teiresias. Moreover in a later study of the important

[1] E. J. Brill, Leiden 1962 (*Mnemosyne* Supp. no. 6). I have abbreviated it hereafter as *PaP*.

Second Hymn, to Apollo, we shall see that the three so-called 'Epiphany' Hymns of Kallimachos all utilize a central idea which transforms a composition of apparent piety into an ingenious and complex structure in which the poet's mischief plays a leading role. I persuade myself that Kallimachos' mischief will, or at least should, win him more friends than belief in his passion or piety.

It is a cardinal tenet for my approach that the humour is generally subterranean, seldom obvious. If, as is now widely accepted, the Hymns were presented to an erudite literary circle, it does not pay to forget that discussion and dissection would ensue. Our poet is one who has provided for a good deal of 'audience participation' from the querulous and perplexed. We are challenged to explain away Kallimachos' erratic moves. His friends must often have questioned his sanity, his enemies have been ready to whisper of the poet's incredible lapses. But both groups, not with the same gentleness, would be convicted of errors of judgment, for Kallimachos shows an uncanny ability to recognize what they will take for granted if he gives but a hint, or does not even mention at all. Competition Square Dancers will know how fatal it is to anticipate the Caller; Kallimachos is no less anxious to eliminate the undiscerning. In such a situation it will be realized immediately that I cannot always expect to anticipate aright precisely the answer, even the kind of answer, that the poet would have given. I can only suggest that this is a field in which benefit accrues no less from asking the right question than from divining the right answer.

It soon became apparent to me that the gulf which scholars fix between the Callimachean and Ovidian treatments of Erysichthon was unreal, that the two accounts levelled out in surprising ways in Kallimachos' subterranean plays. I believe that it is now much easier to convince the reader of the reasonableness of this verdict, because from the island of Kos has come a version of the Erysichthon story with roots deep in antiquity [1]. Its genuineness was accepted by Professor Dawkins, than whom none knew better the obstacles to interpreting folktales of modern Greece as direct legacies from the ancient world, and its validity was acknowledged by more than one reviewer; no one, however, has sought to draw further

[1] Published by R. M. Dawkins, *Forty Five Stories from the Dodecanese* (C.U.P. 1950), pp. 334-349. I am grateful to the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press for permission to quote parts of Professor Dawkins' attractive translation.

conclusions from it. In the first part of this study I venture upon a new examination of the folktale, to put the relationship of Kallimachos and Ovid upon a new footing. The publication by J. Schwartz of a new papyrus of the Hesiodic *Catalogue* was also timely [1], for it provides evidence that 'Hesiod' was not the *primary* source of the Hellenistic researcher.

Since Kallimachos is my focal point of interest no thorough-going study of *origins* has been undertaken, although inevitably some points which may be worthy of further study are mentioned. It seemed to me undesirable to match earlier scholars in speculation on pre-literary forms when it was possible to make a positive contribution to the understanding of the most mischievous of ancient poets; the more so because of the dense fog which envelops Erysichthon, Triopas and Phorbas in Greek mythology, and which overtaxed the vision of a Blinkenberg and the patience of a Zielinski.

The modern study of Erysichthon begins with Th. Zielinski's article in *Philol.* N.F. 4 (1891), 137-162; I have referred to it as Z. 1. In *Iresione* II (*Eos* Supplementa 8, Leopoli 1936), pp. 1-37, Zielinski republished the article with some additions; reference is made to this as Z. 2 for new material only. If I say a good deal about, and against, Zielinski's ideas, it is because they form the basis of many articles in standard works. From the days of Scaliger (*Poetices* V. 8) and Ernesti (*Call. Opera*, 1761, I. 262-5) the treatments by Ovid and Kallimachos have been compared. The following discussions have been used, and are generally referred to without the name of the work: G. Lafaye, *Les Métamorphoses d'Ovide et leurs modèles grecs* (Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Univ. de Paris. xix, 1904), pp. 132 ff.; Malten, *Herm.* 45 (1910), 552; R. Heinze, *Ovids elegische Erzählung* (Berichte Sächs. Akad. Leipzig Phil.-hist. Kl. 71. Bd. 7.Heft, 1919), p. 12; Wilamowitz, *Hellenistische Dichtung* II (1924), pp. 43 f.; H. Diller, 'Die dichterische Eigenart von Ovids Metamorphosen', *Hum. Gymn.* 45 (1934), 25 ff.; P. Grimal, *R.E.L.* 16 (1938), 153 f.; M. M. Crump, *The Epyllion from Theocritus to Ovid* (1931), pp. 239 f.; M. De Cola, *Callimaco e Ovidio* (Studi Palermitani II, 1937), pp. 67 ff.; J. C. Arens, *De godenschildering in Ovidius' Metamorphosen* (Diss. Nijmegen 1946), pp. 114 ff.; G. B. A. Fletcher, *Proc. Class. Assoc.* liv (1957), 23 f.; K. Büchner, *Humanitas Romana* (1957), pp. 203-220.

---

[1] *Pseudo-Hesiodeia* (Leiden 1960), pp. 265 ff.

Émile Cahen's *Callimaque et son oeuvre poétique* (1929) and *Les hymnes de Callimaque* (1930) appear as *Call.* and *Comm*(entaire) respectively. Frequent mention is also made of the useful edition of Ernst Howald and Emil Staiger, *Die Dichtungen von Kallimachos* (Zürich 1955). Further literature is mentioned in the course of the study.

PART A

THE ERYSICHTHON STORY OUTSIDE KALLIMACHOS

I: THE TRADITIONAL SOURCES

From lines 24 to 115 of his *Hymn to Demeter* Kallimachos tells the story of Erysichthon, ostensibly 'so that one may avoid transgressions' (22). The House of Triopas had not yet migrated to Knidos in Asia Minor, but lived on the Dotian plain in Thessaly. There the autochthonous Pelasgians had built a beautiful grove for Demeter; the goddess was as enamoured of it as of Eleusis, and of Triopas as much as of the nymph Enna. But an insane idea entered the head of Triopas' son, Erysichthon. With twenty young giants, his retainers, he rushed into the grove and they set about felling an enormous poplar. Demeter realized the outrage and humanely appeared to the culprit in the form of Nikippe, her aged priestess. But Erysichthon paid no attention to her restrained reproaches, and even threatened to assault the priestess. Infuriated, Demeter reassumed her divine form and towered heaven-high. Erysichthon wanted the timber to roof a banqueting hall; very well, from that day his banquets would come thick and fast. She forthwith inflicted him with insatiable hunger, such that twenty waiters and twelve drink stewards could not assuage.

His parents were mortified. Rather than allow him to be seen outside the palace, they invented all sorts of excuses to explain why he could not accept invitations that were offered. And all the time he ate and ate, until he was nothing but skin and bone. The whole household wept sore, Triopas tore his white hair and challenged his father Poseidon to restore the boy to health, or feed him himself. But the god vouchsafed no answer, and mules, heifer reserved for Hestia, racehorse, warcharger, even the 'mouser', all entered the victim's maw. When even they were gone it was no longer possible to conceal Erysichthon's plight: 'then the king's son sat at the crossroads, begging for crumbs and the household refuse'.

Kallimachos vs. Ovid

The 'superficial' treatment in H. 6, which I have summarized above, contrasts sharply with the account given in Ovid's *Meta-*

morphoses (8. 738-878). There Erysichthon is a constant reviler of the gods, but besides he attacked a giant oak sacred to Ceres. One of his retainers had a change of heart and tried to prevent the outrage, only to be decapitated by Erysichthon, who was prepared also to destroy the goddess if she stood in his way. When the oak was attacked it groaned, shed blood and finally fell, spelling death for the resident hamadryad, who cursed Erysichthon with her dying breath. The nymphs of the forest complained to Ceres, who summoned Hunger from Scythia to infect the villain. The old hag came to Erysichthon and breathed insatiable hunger into him as he slept. Soon Triopas' son had nothing left but his daughter(Mestra), and decided to sell her into slavery. Mestra, however, had earlier been the subject of Poseidon's affections and called upon the seagod, as her new master pursued her along the seashore. The god heard her prayer and changed her into a fisherman. When she returned home and Erysichthon discovered that his daughter had the gift of metamorphosis, he sold her again and again; thereupon she would return to him in animal form. But this did not suffice. Finally he was driven to trying to satisfy his hunger by eating his limbs, with an inevitable result.

Since all our remaining ancient evidence for the story is fragmentary or incomplete, a great amount of time has been devoted by scholars to the relationship of Ovid to Kallimachos. That the former knew the latter was unquestionable, but what construction was to be placed upon divergences of detail, above all upon the entire Mestra episode? Although it is generally recognized that the possession of the two accounts is 'a piece of good luck' [1], the luck has been heavily weighted in Ovid's favour. Kallimachos certainly did not know the Roman, hence interest has largely centred upon the question of how much of the Ovidian account could be credited to the poet's own inventiveness. The fertile imagination of Ovid of course invited the answer: 'A good deal'; for the later argument it will be useful to recall exactly how much.

Prof. Rose [2], for example, was among those who saw the death of the nymph in Ovid as a conscious improvement upon the earlier story. P. Grimal (p. 153), on the basis of the Roman approach to the depiction of landscape, finds that Ovid has transformed and modified the sacred grove: oak instead of poplar, one tree the

[1] Büchner, *Humanitas Romana*, p. 206.
[2] *Handbook of Greek Mythology*, p. 95.

size of a forest instead of a forest itself. Wilamowitz [1] complains that Ovid's inventiveness has even been underestimated. Kallimachos was his only source for the Erysichthon story; 'so ist in allem Ovid selbst der Dichter; die griechischen Vorlagen, selbst Kallimachos, geben ihm nur Stoff oder Anregung zu eigener Erfindung'. Crump (p. 240) maintains that 'in all cases where an earlier treatment of the story still exists, Ovid's treatment is original'. According to De Cola (p. 68) Ovid imitates Kallimachos faithfully enough in the essential features of the legend, but transforms him 'according to his own tendencies'. Heinze (p. 12) shows the special use that Ovid makes of *ira deorum*, exaggerating the nature of the offence. Ovid provides an 'epic' translation of the Callimachean version (which has a primitive folktale character); hence the absence of the realistic detail provided by Kallimachos. To Malten (p. 552) also, where Ovid follows the Hellenistic story, he exaggerates. Finally, in considerable detail Diller and Büchner strove to show that Ovid's tale is a new creation, and a thoroughly Roman one in its orientation of thought.

Certainly there are features of the Ovidian presentation which cohere. For example, the fact that the story follows the Phrygian tale of Baucis and Philemon must be quite deliberate: 'beide Geschichten . . . sind Gegenstücke und nicht voneinander abzutrennen. Hier sind die *pii*, dort der Frevler.' [2] The simple needs and piety of the elderly couple are undoubtedly to be set beside the insatiable appetite and impiety of Erysichthon. The iniquity of the latter runs through the episode like a refrain: 739 *qui numina diuum sperneret* etc.; 754 *sceleratus*; 755-6 the oath; 761 *manus impia*; 765-9 the murder of the pious follower; 774 *scelus*; 791-2 *praecordia . . . sacrilegi scelerata*; 817 *sacrilegi*; 840 *profani*. On such *Leitworte* Büchner (pp. 210 f.) has much that is valuable to say; Heinze also when he compares Ovid's Erysichthon with Vergil's Mezentius, *contemptor diuom* [3]. There may also be a direct verbal parallel between Ovid's two stories: 'dicite, *iuste* senex et femina *coniuge iusto/digna*, quid optetis?' (704-5) compared with 'filia . . . *non illo digna parente*' (847) and 'auido *non iusta* alimenta parenti' (874). But incredibly small attention has been paid to the question of whether Kallimachos also had a specific purpose which transform-

[1] *Hell. Dicht.*, II p. 43 f.
[2] Büchner, p. 219.
[3] *Aen.* 10.204.

ed an earlier tale; those who have made most progress have remained content with the assumption that the creation of a domestic situation is the poet's primary concern. We shall see that there were wider issues which—whether Ovid understood them all clearly or not (the latter possibility being by no means the absurdity that it may at first seem, when we are dealing with involved Occasional Poetry)—would prevent the Roman from utilizing some of the most individualistic features of the *Hymn to Demeter*.

Erysichthon and Aithon

If we leave aside for more detailed discussion the Hesiodic evidence our earliest complete and explicit statement dealing with the legend of Erysichthon is provided by Hellanikos in the first book of his *Deukalioneia* (4 F 7 Jacoby), cited by Athenaios [1]: Ἑλλάνικος . . . Ἐρυσίχθονά φησι τὸν Μυρμιδόνος, ὅτι ἦν ἄπληστος βορᾶς, Αἴθωνα κληθῆναι. This remark is repeated by Aelian [2] and also by Eustathius [3]. Here the villain is declared to be the son of *Myrmidon* and to have borne the nickname *Aithon*. Both of these factors will prove important. We have already met in Kallimachos Triopas as the father of Erysichthon; Hellanikos is the earliest source which involves Myrmidon. Now there must have been a time when this implied no contradiction, for folktales are notoriously prone to withhold proper names from their characters and provide them instead with ethnic titles. If there is one feature of the story which is always taken for granted, it is that the offence was committed in Thessaly. Now Myrmidon is the eponymous hero of the Myrmidonians, or Thessalians, and originally Erysichthon must have been the son of 'the Thessalian'. The moment, however, that this was expressed in genealogical poetry as involving descent from Myrmidon (the latter having become by a series of similar transformations a creature of flesh and blood), then the eponym of the Thessalian people entered into competition with Triopas in literature for the dubious honour of being Erysichthon's father.

If Erysichthon received the nickname of Aithon it was because a tale with similar broad features was also told of a person called

---

[1] *Deipn.* X. 416b.

[2] *V.H.* I. 27 ἀδηφάγους λέγουσιν ἀνθρώπους γεγονέναι . . . καὶ Ἐρυσίχθονα τὸν Μυρμιδόνος, ἔνθεν τοι καὶ Αἴθων (MSS. κάνθων, κλάδων: corr. Scheffer) ἐκλήθη οὗτος.

[3] *Il.* 862. 7 ff. ἐρρέθη δὲ ἰδίως Αἴθων καὶ Ἐρυσίχθων ὁ Μυρμιδόνος διὰ τὸ εἶναι, φασί, βορᾶς ἄπληστος.

Aithon. It is the great achievement of Zielinski to have made reasonable the belief that, in its later forms, the story is a conflation, of an Erysichthon who offended Demeter and a starving Aithon who had a daughter Mestra. The connecting link must have a common feature of violent hunger. At a certain stage then the two were integrated by drawing upon the usage of αἴθων λιμός as 'ravening hunger'. The artifice is clearly evident in the fact that Aithon cannot mean the man with αἴθων λιμός, except to a poet who is straining language in order to make a tidy conflation. But once the association has been made, it will be possible for Kallimachos to remember that Hunger, rather than Erysichthon, is the term of reference which gives Aithon real meaning, and to create a fascinating new dimension for his Hymn.

Aithon as a Proper Name

Before we turn to the moment of conflation, the name of Aithon deserves a discussion. It seems to me beyond dispute that this name originally had no connexion with the nature of its bearer's offence [1], if in fact this tale involved an offence at all. The most celebrated claimant to the name was Odysseus, in the Cretan lineage which he fabricated for himself at *Od.* 19. 193 before an unsuspecting Penelope [2]. What precise significance we are to

[1] Wilamowitz (*Hell. Dicht.*, II p. 41) seems to sport with both hounds and hares when he writes: 'Der Träger der Geschichte hiess zuerst Aithon; das ist ein Name so gut wie jeder andere, ward aber gewählt, weil der heisse Hunger αἴθων oder αἶθοψ von den Dichtern genannt ward'.

[2] The most recent discussion of this point that I have noticed is that of W. B. Stanford *ad Od.* 19. 182 ff., which is alluded to again in his *The Ulysses Theme* (1954): 'It has been ingeniously suggested by E. Maas that this would suggest 'Foxy' to the wise, as Pindar uses the word as an epithet ('red-brown') of the fox in Olympians 11, 19'. This is no new idea, for it was already held by F. G. Welcker, *Append. ad Tril.*, p. 317, E. Müller, *De Aethone satyrico Achaei Eretriensis* (1837), pp. 4-10, and L. Urlichs, *Philol.* 1 (1846), 560. Urlichs makes it sound attractive: 'Quod igitur Αἴθων nomen sibi esse finxit Ulixes . . . id idcirco factum est, quod ἴσκε ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα et περὶ κέρδεα πολλὰ καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων οἶδ' Ὀδυσεύς, unde a Sophocle Ai. 103 τοὐπίτριπτον κίναδος diserte nominatur'. But long ago Wagner raised two pertinent objections. How does αἴθων become applied *par excellence* to the fox, when it is used freely of a host of animals? If such a usage were possible, why have no traces survived elsewhere, especially in view of the frequency of reference to the fox's cunning in later literature?

Dorothea H. F. Gray (*J.H.S.* 78 (1958), 44) is perhaps following a hotter scent when she thinks of a Cretan cycle. (At the same time it is unwise to talk of Aithon as the *bastard* son of Deukalion, for this seems ultimately to depend on confused scholia on the Homeric passage and a superseded text

attach to the name has now been made the more uncertain by the decipherment of Linear B, for it disclosed an *ai-to*, presumably Aithon, who seems to be in arrears with the payment of a tribute of rams [1]. The name recurs in Phigaleia in Arcadia [2] and also, it would seem, on Delos [3], later it was to appear in

---

of Apollod. III. 3. 1; cf. *F.H.G.* I p. 152 Müller). For discussion of the problem see R. B. Woolsey, *C. Ph.* 36 (1941), 173-7; C. R. Trahman, *Phoenix* 5 (1951), 1-10; F. Robert, *Homère* (1950), 171 ff.

[1] KN Da 6061; Ventris-Chadwick, *Documents*, pp. 197 f. The leading actors in our story are of great antiquity. Triopas occurs in Linear B at KN Sc 226, Vc 303, X 294, perhaps X 1384. The first of these passages is the only informative reference (Ventris-Chadwick, *Documents* no. 298); from it we learn that the bearer of the name was a charioteer. For the status of charioteers, see Webster, *Antiquity* 29 (1955), 13 and 31 (1957), 7; for the name itself, O. Landau, *Mykenisch-griechische Personennamen* (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 7, 1958), p. 159; for the value of pa_2 (ti-ri-jo-pa_2), the discussion in *Études Mycéniennes* (*Gif-Sur-Yvette*, 3-7 *Avril* 1956), pp. 51 ff., 88, 245 f. In the texts Poseidon (who has close connexions with the Triopids) assumes more importance than Zeus (cf. Palmer, *Trans. Philol. Soc.* 1958, 7 f.).

Prof. T. B. L. Webster is always ready to take the first plunge to invite us to try the water: 'The Pylos tablet, Tn 316, is evidence both for ritual formulae, which may be one of the origins of Homeric repetitions, and for the existence of the Poseidon, Iphimedeia, Otos and Ephialtes story in the thirteenth century; mortals were already then named after gods'. (ΙΡΙΣ, *News-Sheet of Class. Assoc. of Victoria*, xlv. 2, Aug. 1959). This was part of the summary of a lecture at which he also included Triopas (as father of Iphimedeia) within his Mycenean story. This is of course not the only possibility, but if he has any chance at all of being right, the difficulties of tracking the sources of stories in the Triopas cycle are painfully obvious.

[2] *IG* V 2. 425_4 (5 c.).

[3] *S.E.G.* III ii p. 124 no. 666 line 6 (= *IG* XI 1054^a with Wilhelm's supplements in *Anz. Ak. Wien* 1924, pp. 133 f.): Μηνιάδα Αἴθω[νος. Two attempts to find other persons called Aithon in Greece must be rejected. Firstly, Pape-Benseler s.v. *Aithon* 2) state 'V. des Tantalus, Luc. *in* Nat. Com. 6, 18'. Ch. Autran, *Introduction à l'étude critique du nom propre grec*, p. 489, accepted this and tried to give the Aithon-Tantalos relationship a Lydio-Etruscan basis. F. Mentz (*Philol.* 88 (1933), 106) also utilized it, inadvertently adding to the confusion by reading V(ater) as B(einame). Natalis Comes always arouses suspicion, and we see here good reason for mistrust. The supposed relationship is based on the inscription in Lucian *Dips.* 6, reading Αἴθονος υἱὸν where αἴθοπος ἰοῦ is the vulgate ! Secondly, Pherekydes is reported by Schol. Ap. Rhod. III 62 (3 F 51b Jacoby) to have described Ixion as <υἱὸς> Αἴτωνος. This was hesitantly emended to Αἴθωνος by K. O. Müller (*F.H.G.* I. 96-7), although not for the first time; his form was already read without question in 1514 by Murmellius (*Comm. in Boeth. de Consol. Philosophiae*, Migne *Patr. Lat.* 63. 1041). The emendation was followed in Müller's *Orchomenos und die Minyer* (rev. F. W. Schneidewin), p. 197 and supported by Roscher *s.v.* Aithon, Weizsäcker (Roscher II, i. 770) and Cook, *Zeus* I p. 199 n. 4. Most have preferred to read with Wesseling Φερεκύδης <δὲ Πεισίωνος, Αἰσχύλος> δὲ 'Αντίωνος; cf. Schol. Pind. *P.* 2. 40,

Rome [1]. In literature there is Αἴθων μὲν γένος εἰμί at Theogn. 1209 (which is frequently associated with the idea of 'an Incognito', deriving from Odysseus' use of the name), Achaios' satyr-play *Aithon* and the unhappy parasite at Martial 12. 77, apart from clear references to Odysseus and Erysichthon.

For the Theognidean passage I have suggested in *Mnem.* S. IV. 14 (1961), 16-22 that the expression introduces a *griphos*: 'I am of the *aithon*-class', and that the reader who is not beguiled by the most obscure sense which can be extracted from the poem at the surface level, is invited to determine what the thing is which may be described as *aithon*. I do not require the reader to share my belief that the answer is a stone lion in a Theban cemetery, but I think it reasonable to point out that the opening words must be either corrupt or involve a special play. If the poem is rightly seen as a riddle, then the most that one can say for our present discussion is that the superficial pattern relies upon the naturalness of Aithon as a proper name, just as of Argyris (1212), who is in this special context merely an ἀργυρίς, a silver drinking cup.

At *Mnem.* S. IV. 14 (1961), 324 I have also attached special significance to the occurrence in Martial. The parasite who breaks wind in the temple of Capitoline Jupiter and is condemned to dine at home for three days by the irate divinity is, if we remember that *domicenium* for him is starvation, Erysichthon-Aithon in a new and whimsical form. When, in his eagerness to avoid a second offence, Aethon prays to Jupiter *compressis natibus*, we are reminded not only of Trygaios' parody of the ritual formula at Ar. *Pax* 96 ff. (εὐφημεῖν χρὴ καὶ μὴ φλαῦρον μηδὲν γρύζειν . . . καὶ τοὺς πρωκτοὺς ἐπικλείειν) [2], but also of the sinister end of Erysichthon, should Jupiter choose to make the punishment of longer duration. Such a treatment suggests to me that Martial is modernising a *trite* theme of his day; but, in any case, the use is special.

The subject of Achaios' *Aithon* will be discussed a little later. It can involve only Odysseus or Erysichthon as far as we can see, and is therefore not an independent testimony for the name of Aithon in general use. The importance of the play derives from the

Diod. Sic. 4. 69. 3. A hunger motif occurs for Phlegyas (for whom Aithon was assumed to be a nickname), but only in late authors (Stat. *Theb.* 1. 712 ff., Val. Flacc. 2. 192 ff.).

[1] See the Latin Thesaurus s.v. Aethon.

[2] Instead of the customary τὰ στόματα. Cf. Kleinknecht, *Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike* (1937), p. 21 n. 4.

consideration that, if Erysichthon proves to be the more likely contender, then the early comic treatment of the story would become a valuable ally for my interpretation of Kallimachos' Sixth Hymn as riotous comedy.

When Aithon appears as the name of an animal it is most likely that its primary reference is to colour. The adjective which is applied to horses at *Il.* 2.839 = 12.97 becomes the name of a horse of Hector (*Il.* 8. 185) and various other heroes [1]; in it we may see, with E. Delebecque [2], 'αἴθων, sans doute alezan "brûlé" (couleur de café torréfié)'. And I should imagine that there is also a colour reference in its use as the name of one of Aktaion's dogs (Hyg. *fab.* 181), although αἴθων κύων does not survive, except for a riddling allusion to Sirius in Lycophr. 925. This would certainly be the case for Aithon as the name of the eagle which devoured Prometheus' liver, but that this is the correct interpretation of Hyg. *fab.* 31.5 is far from certain [3]. But the use of the adjective for warriors at Aesch. *Sept.* 448; Soph. *Ai.* 221, 1088; (Eur.) *Rhes.* 122; Lycophr. 109 and its association with wild animals in general at Plat. *Rep.* 559 d and Opp. *Cyn.* 1.203 show the existence of not only reference to fiery colour, but also 'burning, fiery' temperament. It is in consequence paraphrased in the lexica as ἀνδρεῖος, πολεμικός [4]. For all we know, this development may already be represented in the Mycenean reference, in Odysseus' pseudonym, even in the association of αἴθων with lion, bull and steed in contexts of violent action [5].

---

[1] See *R.E. s.v.* Aithon and add Aithon as the horse ridden by Ethiopian Memnon (Roberts, *Introduction to Greek Epigraphy,* I no. 89 p. 121; P. Ducati, *Storia della ceramica greca* (1922), pp. 116 f.).

[2] *Le Cheval dans l'Iliade* (1951), p. 144.

[3] Prometheus' scourge is 'aethonem aquilam'. Rose *ad loc.* (cf. *Mnem.* S. IV. 11 (1958), 47) interprets: 'Graecus αἴθωνα dixerat aquilam, adhibito nimirum loco poetico, cf. O 690' (also Sib. Or. III. 611). Formerly the adjective was read with a capital letter (e.g. by Gruppe, II 1025; F. Mentz, *Philol.* 88 (1933), 106). Doubtless Rose was right, but I give the question space for a special reason. The αἰετὸς αἴθων, the more so if this particular bird may actually have been named Aithon, would suggest a reason for Kallimachos' use at H. 6. 87 (πανάμερος εἰλαπιναστάς, Erysichthon) of Aesch. *P.V.* 1024 (δαιταλεὺς πανήμερος, Prometheus' eagle).

[4] E.g. Bachmann, *Anecd. gr.* I p. 49.

[5] How difficult plotting the semantic development of a term may be can be illustrated from Serv. *Aen.* 11. 90 (on the association of αἴθων with horses): 'vel a cursus celeritate, quasi ἀεὶ θέων i.e. perpetuo currens, indefessus' (cf. Schol. Opp. *Cyn.* 1. 309 αἴθωνας· ταχύας). Precisely because there are no extant examples of αἴθων used unequivocally as 'swift' we reject such an interpretation as late, but even a Plato could explain αἰθήρ as ἀειθεήρ

It is certainly the most likely significance of the name when applied to humans, including the subject of our present story, even if a reference to complexion or colour of hair cannot be positively disproved.

What makes this question worth discussion is the special significance attached to the name by Zielinski and the measure of popularity which it has enjoyed. The starting point was the statement in the Suda s.v. Αἴθων· ὁ βίαιος λιμός. ἀπὸ Αἴθωνος Ἡλίου τινός· ὃς τὸ Δήμητρος ἄλσος κατέκοψε καὶ τιμωρίαν ὑπέστη ἀξίαν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐλίμωττεν αἰεί. Zielinski (Z. I. 147) explained the relationship between Helios and Aithon as deriving from ἥλιος αἴθων, although curiously he never cites Pind. *Nem.* 7. 73 for the existence of the phrase. Just as Halirrothios, son of Poseidon, developed out of an epithet of the seagod [1], so also Aithon. He compares Lampetie and Phaethusa (*Od.* 12.132), Phaethon (cf. Ἠέλιος φαέθων *Il.* 11. 735), Aigle (cf. ἡλίου αἴγλης *Od.* 4.45) and Pasiphae (cf. πασιφαής as an epithet of the sun at Orph. Hymn. 7.14) as similar creations from titles of Helios. He further supports the argument by following Preller and H. D. Müller in deriving Mestra from μήδομαι (cf. μήστωρ), 'die Weise', and connecting her as a *pharmakis* with Medeia and Agamede (or Perimede, *Il.* 11.741), all of cognate name and all granddaughters of the Sun (Z. I. 148).

Secondly he applies this conclusion to the use of Aithon at *Od.* 19.193. We know from Ov. *Met.* 8. 738 that Mestra eventually becomes the wife of Autolykos, himself the father of Antikleia, Odysseus' mother. Therefore Odysseus had Aithon as his maternal great grandfather, and borrowed his name for the fictitious Cretan tale (Z. I. 153). This hypothesis immediately leaves unexplained why he should fasten upon the name of so remote an ancestor, above all in so pronounced a Cretan setting, but runs up against an insurmountable obstacle besides. In the same book of the Odyssey, at line 416, the name of Antikleia's mother is provided for us. It is not Mestra, but Amphithea. Whatever the antiquity of Autolykos' marriage with Mestra, it is consequently hard to believe that it was an event in the history of Odysseus' family, and cannot be used to elucidate Cretan Aithon.

'always running' (*Cratyl.* 410 B; cf. Arist. *de Caelo* 270 b 21 ff.). Our tidy reconstructions may be hampered more than once by such flights of fancy.

[1] Further examples are provided by M. Sulzberger, *R.E.G.* 39 (1926), 439 ff.; Jessen, *R.E.* viii, I. 81. 39 ff.

Since to J. Schwartz [1] Aithon is still 'personnage plus ou moins solaire', the reader should be reminded that the trustworthiness of the passage in the Suda has often been brought under attack. This is our only source for the association of Aithon and Helios, and since the Rhodian version of the descent of Triopas makes him a son of Helios [2], this is itself enough to arouse our suspicions that the Suda shows some comparatively late levelling of the versions; the more so, as the Suda is the only source which actually credits Aithon with an offence—and that the offence of Erysichthon—and, in defining the relationship between αἴθων λιμός and Aithon, joins the Laurentian Scholiast on Aeschin. 3. 183 [3] in putting the cart before the horse.

Attempts to emend have not inspired confidence. Reinesius' Θετταλοῦ [4] and Preller's Ἐρυσίχθονος [5] make impossible demands upon our goodwill. The suggestions of O. Crusius [6] (<τοῦ Τριόπα> Ἡλίου) and Mayer [7] (<Τρίοπος> Ἡλίου, with τινος explained as a corruption of Τρίοπος) depend upon scribal weariness, rather than any apparent reason in the text for omission of a word or phrase. Most discussion has centred around the idea of Toup (supported by Bekker), that we should read Ἠλείου, and make Aithon an Elean. Crusius opposed the suggestion, protesting that there was no trace of Elis in the Erysichthon story. It would always have been possible to retort that this Aithon may exist apart from Erysichthon, hence in Elis as likely as anywhere else, but understandably the question was examined at a level at which argument was possible.

Wilamowitz, with characteristic bluntness, declared Ἡλίου 'der dumme Itazismus' [8] and defended Toup on three grounds. Firstly, that no Greek could misuse τινος in the way in which the Suda does, whether it refers to Helios or Aithon in the sentence. Secondly, that the existence of the old cult of Demeter Chamyna in Elis is suggestive. Thirdly, that many Thessalian features recur in Elis. Zielinski (Z. 2.14 n. 3), however, puts up rather a good case in opposition. Firstly, how was it possible to express otherwise 'ab

---

1 *Pseudo-Hesiodeia* (1960), p. 279 n. 1.

2 Diod. Sic. V. 61. 3.

3 (F. Schultz' Teubner edtn. 1865) Οἱ δὲ <say that λιμός is called αἴθων> ὅτι ἐγένετό τις Αἴθων γαστρίμαργος καὶ πάντοτε ἐλίμωττεν, ἀφ' οὗ ὁ λιμὸς αἴθων.

4 *Var. lect.* 3, 370.

5 *Demeter und Persephone*, p. 333 n. 11.

6 Roscher s.v. Erysichthon (1), col. 1375 n.

7 Roscher s.v. Triopas, col. 1119. 19 ff.

8 *Hell. Dicht.* II p. 40.

Aethone *quodam* Solis filio' in good Greek? Secondly, Wilamowitz himself [1] has the tale involving Triopas (with whom he unhappily identifies Aithon) invented in Knidos, and the association with Thessaly only a 'Retroprojektion'. Wilamowitz therefore should assume Knidian influence in Elis. Thirdly, the existence of Demeter Chamyna in Elis is a proof of nothing. There is a good deal to be said for these objections, but it is for the ignoble reason that I see no convincing method of emendation [2] that I am inclined to accept the text.

But the Suda remains an isolated witness. There is reason to believe that the Erysichthon story has been coloured as the result of the Rhodian hegemony [3]; it would also be reasonable to find it here. Above all the ascription to Aithon of the offence ascribed to Erysichthon should be treated with suspicion, for I find it hard to believe that the two conflated stories were originally similar to this degree (an identical offence committed against the same divinity). This is, to be sure, not the only relationship possible and because the nature of Erysichthon's offence is unusual, perhaps it should be treated here.

The Scene of the Crime

'The odd thing about the story', remarks Professor Rose [4], 'is that the cutting down of trees should so bitterly offend Demeter in particular'. The anguish of a Hamadryad would be readily understood, but why Demeter? [5] Perhaps a good deal hangs upon this question. For most authors who refer to the incident the goddess's concern is certainly for her grove: ἄλσος Call. H. 6. 25, 36;

[1] *Ibidem*, p. 35.

[2] I once thought of ἠλεοῦ 'crazed, infatuate', derived from a poetic source (ἠλεὸς Αἴθων); this goes at least part of the way towards parallelling τις Αἴθων γαστρίμαργος in the Scholiast on Aeschines (for these two passages put the cart before the horse by deriving αἴθων λιμός from Aithon, and therefore may show some affinity). But ἠλεός is still rather too vague.

[3] Cf. Wilamowitz, *Hell. Dicht.* II p. 36; Z. 2. 14 n. 3.

[4] *Handbook of Greek Mythology*, p. 95.

[5] The counterpart in folklore is, for example, the story of the daimon Anagyrasios, who, when his grove was cut down, vented his wrath on the offender's son by inspiring a Potiphar's Wife Sequence (see Suda s.v. Ἀναγυράσιος; Edmonds, *Fragments of Greek Comedy* I p. 582). This is a far cry from Demeter. A good illustration of deep-seatedness of belief in the sanctity of particular groves is provided by C. Boetticher, *Der Baumkultus der Hellenen* (1856), p. 201: 'Der Khalif Motawakkel wurde von seiner eigenen Leibwache in Stücke gehauen als er die heilige von Zoroaster zu Kaschmer gepflanzte Cypresse hatte fällen lassen um ihr Holz zum Baue seines Palastes zu benutzen'. An earthy *aition* of the Gonds from Tikaitola, Rewa State, in

Suda s.v. Αἴθων; Tzetz. *ad* Lycophr. 1393; *nemus* Ov. *Met.* 8. 741, *luci* 742. In such company Kallimachos' use of ἱερόν at H. 6. 49 is clearly parallel to ἱερὸς χῶρος in H. 5. 76, and means no more. But there is a text which suggests that the idea that Demeter guards all her property, τὰ θεοῖσιν ἀνειμένα (H. 6. 46), is too simple an answer. In the second poem which Marcellus of Side composed on commission from Herodes Atticus, to grace the latter's estate near Rome, which in imitation of the famous foundation at Knidos he called the Triopium [1], a different story is told [2]:

India, which is told by V. Elwin, *Myths of Middle India* (1949), p. 297, has several points of parallel with the Greek story of Erysichthon's outrage and punishment.

[1] On this see Münscher, *R.E.* viii, 1 (1912), 937 ff.; Wilamowitz, 'Marcellus von Side', SB. Berlin 1928; W. Kroll, *R.E.* xiv ii (1930), 1496 f.; J. Weiss, *R.E.* vii A i (1939), 176 f. There is a popular treatment of Herodes by H. C. Rutledge in *Class. Journ.* 56 (1960), 97-109. *IG.* xiv 1389 i refers to a cult which Herodes organized for his wife Regilla after her death; 1389 ii provides an elaborate exhortation for the preservation of the estate from injury, similar in message to the herm-inscription which Herodes erected on his Greek properties (P. Graindor, *B.C.H.* 38 (1914), 355, 365; Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, p. 116 n. 199). The lines cited (36 f.) come from the second inscription, which occasions some surprise. The Triopium was dedicated to Demeter and Persephone and Nemesis. It seems to owe its name to a temple which Herodes built to the elder Faustina as Demeter in it, but there were probably contributing factors; he was taught by Theagenes of Knidos and had spent many years in Asia Minor, while Regilla was priestess of Demeter Chamyne at Olympia (cf. Paus. 6. 21. 1; Münscher, 939. 2 ff.). We should therefore expect that Marcellus' account of the outrage against Demeter would bear the *imprimatur* of Herodes, and would also conform to current doctrine at the Cnidian Triopion. But we do not expect to find Triopas as the offender.

It would be idle to pretend that our knowledge of the Cnidian Triopion, particularly of its status in a given century, was adequate. It is beyond the scope of this present study, but a few things should be noted. Apollo, Poseidon and the nymphs are associated with the Triopion, but curiously not Demeter; there is no doubt of her importance at Knidos and her influence in Sicily when Rhodian and Cnidian colonization was at its height (Hdt. 7. 153; Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks*, p. 64; R. van Compernolle, 'Les Deinoménides et le culte de Déméter et Korè à Géla', *Hommages W. Déonna*, pp. 474-9). We do not know at what date Poseidon and the Nymphs were added to the cult. Nilsson (*Gr. Feste*, p. 178) is inclined to see the influence of Philadelphos (cf. Hanell, *R.E.* vii A col. 175. 36 ff., Jacoby *ad* 444 F 2). Apollo is mentioned as early as Hdt. 1. 144, but his colleagues only in Scholia on Theocr. 17. 68/69. W. W. Tarn (*J.H.S.* 30 (1910), 214) regards the Triopian sanctuary and festival as purely a local affair in the third century, and he is probably right. For the geography of Knidos and the Triopion, see G. E. Bean-J. M. Cook, *Ann. B. S. Athens* 47 (1952), 171-212; 52 (1957), 85 ff.

[2] The difference is made the more striking by the fact that Kallimachos and Lykophron use the Triopas-Erysichthon version.

Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἴφθιμον Τριόπεω μένος Αἰολίδαο
ὤναθ' ὅτε νειὸν Δημήτερος ἐξαλάπαξεν.

The inscription reads νειόν, but editors have generally preferred to emend to νηόν. Eichstädt [1] seems to have set the pattern, leaning heavily on the confusion of ει and η through phonetic levelling, which occurs in fact twice in line 4 (πείονα, τειμήσατε). Boeckh [2] drew upon other authors for support: 'De templo diruto loquuntur Diodorus (V. 61) et Hyginus (*Poet. Astr.* 2. 14)'. At first sight this is attractively tidy, for it is precisely Marcellus, Diodoros and Hyginus who represent Triopas himself as the offender.

But in fact Diodoros does not say *templum* but *temenos*, and Boeckh curiously made the same mistake as 'Hyginus', for it has long been seen that the *templum* of the latter is in all probability a faulty translation of *temenos* which he found in some Greek handbook. If Marcellus alone definitely writes of a temple, we must explain it either as an incredible lapse or as an aberrant version. If the latter were the case it would of course be hardly likely to be of great antiquity. But the text becomes of great importance if νειόν is really a genuine reading.

Greatest support for this idea has come from Ennio Quirino Visconti (*Iscrizioni greche Triopee ora Borghesiane*, Rome 1794, p. 70). He saw a reference to *novale*, suggesting that here, as well as in introducing Triopas as the culprit, Marcellus was following another tradition. Visconti's work was not entirely satisfactory, for he made the Triopas of line 5 the Argive figure of the same name (whom he believed introduced as one of the early propagators of Demeter's cult) and Triopas of line 36 the character of Thessalian mythology. Beyond doubt Triopas of Thessaly is under discussion in both places. But still there is merit in νειόν. The spelling of the text does not tell decisively against it, for at line 31 νηῶι is successfully inscribed; it is therefore as possible that νειόν is correctly cut. Moreover, while three authorities agree over Triopas' guilt, Marcellus' version must stand alone, whichever reading is accepted. If we also bear in mind the polymathy of both Marcellus and Herodes, it is not easy to believe that their version is insignificant. Both Hyginus and Diodoros explicitly associate the crime with the felling of trees to build a palace; the reading of Marcellus, in either case, will be unique.

1 *Allg. Literaturzeitung*, Jena 1796, pp. 482 ff.
2 *Inscr. Gr.* no. 6280.

If Triopas' crime was presented as the invasion of Demeter's sacred ploughland [1], this gives in the first place an admirable sense: we see a good reason why such a goddess should be so enraged. But moreover the idea would stand a very good chance of being original, for Erysichthon as much as Triopas. Now if the starting point was *temenos*, it would be possible to reconstruct the manner in which the story has changed direction. The *temenos* was an 'area of agricultural land set aside for a chieftain' [2]. Later it became the precinct of a divinity [3]. This area was partly ploughland, partly orchard or vineyard. So the Lycians gave Bellerophon a fine *temenos* φυταλιῆς καὶ ἀρούρης [4]. If Ventris-Chadwick are right in reading pe-pu$_2$-te-me-no (πεφυτευμένος, 'planted with fruit trees') in Er 02. 2 and in regarding Er 01 and 02 as complementary (concerning acreages of wheatfields and the census of trees or vines in orchards), then the same picture appears for Mycenean times, as would not surprise. At a later stage the *temenos* was to contain the god's altar, and eventually shrine, while from the earliest times we may reasonably assume that it harboured a small copse, the last abode of the tree spirits when the land was cleared for cultivation. I suggest therefore that it was first said that 'Triopas/Erysichthon ravaged the *temenos* of Demeter', that at the beginning this meant misuse of sacred ploughland but later was reinterpreted by poets when they came to develop the story [5].

---

[1] As long as we had only Ellis' collation of the scholia on Ovid's *Ibis*, it was possible to believe with him that the following comments on lines 615-6 were 'a wrong interpretation but an ancient one': *G* 'Erisicus, quia fuit vastator segetis, a Cerere missus in exilium, fame periit'; *C* 'Eristeus, quia vastator erat segetum, a Cerere missus in exilium periit fame'. This seemed to testify to another, and important, form of the Erysichthon story. Our discovery from the Callimachean Diegeseis that C and Askewianus, 'duo nebulones', were right in deriving *Ib.* 467 from Kallimachos, evoking the comment from Lenz (edtn. of *Ibis*^{2}, pp. 105 f.): 'Fateri cogimur etiam in hos rivulos foedo limo turbatos e primario fonte aquam puram fluxisse', made it possible to entertain the thought with a little more confidence. But now A. La Penna (*Schol. in P. Ovidi Nasonis Ibin*, 1959, pp. xx, 194n.), who can cite a larger number of MSS., has cast doubts upon the value of the evidence. I shall therefore not hang my argument upon it.

[2] Ventris-Chadwick, *Documents*, nos. 152, 153, pp. 266 f. = PY Er 01 and 02; cf. M. I. Finley, *Historia* 6 (1957), 148-159.

[3] T. B. L. Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer* (London 1958), pp. 106 f., prefers to believe that the *temenos* 'implies divine status'.

[4] *Il.* 6. 194 f. Cf. 12. 313 f., 20. 185; also 9. 578 f. (τέμενος . . . . τὸ μὲν ἥμισυ οἰνοπέδοιο, ἥμισυ δὲ ψιλὴν ἄροσιν), 18. 550; Schol. *T Il.* 12. 313.

[5] In this semantic area a good deal of overlapping was possible, calculated to make a shift of emphasis easy. Ἄλσος is used of the whole sacred

If this suggestion has a chance of being useful, it might immediately be asked whether the statement in the Suda has not an important part to play; perhaps an Aithon who cut down trees has been amalgamated with a Triopas/Erysichthon who ravaged a *temenos*. However if Aithon's offence involved Demeter, we would then be back where we started. Moreover the Suda is not the place in which one would expect to find a testimony which cast light on such a distant past; I have the impression that the significant role of Aithon in the original story was his fatherhood and little more. It was his daughter, Mestra the Wise, who stole the limelight.

Hesiod and Aithon

A *terminus post quem non* for the conflation of the Aithon and Erysichthon stories can now be regarded as certain. Tzetzes (*ad* Lycophr. 1393 ff.) was the first to tell us: 'Erysichthon was called Aithon, as Hesiod says, because of his hunger'. Since Marckscheffel's day this has often been assumed to repose upon a simple error; Tzetzes was really alluding to Hes. *Op*. 363, where αἴθοπα λιμόν occurs in our MSS. (and Bergk has argued for αἴθονα). This interpretation seemed the more natural because of another scholiast's paraphrase [1]: Αἴθων δὲ Ἐρυσίχθων διὰ τὸ βίαιον τῆς λιμοῦ ἐπεκλήθη· ὡς καὶ Ἡσίοδος· ὁ δ' ἀλύξεται (*pro* ἀλέξεται) αἴθοπα λιμόν. In 1866 however T. Gomperz published *Herkulanische Studien* ii, containing the lacunose text of Philodemos' περὶ εὐσεβείας. It excited no comment on the present question until 1898, when Wilamowitz [2] discussed briefly the significance of p. 49 G, where Mestra's powers of metamorphosis were mentioned and Hesiod

enclosure, that is, as *temenos* (Pind. *O*. 3. 18, 7. 49), and the Scholiast at the former passage (cf. Strab. ix. 412 f.) comments: ἴσθι ὅτι πᾶν χωρίον τοῖς θεοῖς ἀφιερωμένον, κἂν ψιλὸν φυτῶν ᾖ, ἄλσος καλεῖται. Just as Pyrasos and Syracuse are respectively the τεμένη of Demeter and Ares (*Il*. 2. 696, Pind. *P*. 2. 2), so Onchestos, Thebes and Eleusis are the ἄλση of Poseidon, Thebe and Demeter (*Il*. 2. 506, Soph. *Ant*. 845, Pind. *Isthm*. 1. 57-8). For τέμενος as 'grove' see Tim. *Pers*. 211; H. H. *Ven*. 267 *may* have the same meaning. Again, common verbs can be found. Erysichthon's action in cutting down trees is described by ἐκκεραΐζειν (H. 6. 49); Marcellus used ἐξαλαπάζειν. Both of these verbs have a wide connotation. Κείρειν also may imply ravaging by cutting down trees, or have a general meaning of 'destroying'. And it is not uncommon to find bracketed together pasturing flocks, sowing crops and cutting timber as activities prohibited on sacred ground (as in the Cretan precinct of Dictaean Zeus, *S.I.G*. 685. 81 f.).

[1] *E Cod. Paris*. 345 = *Anecd. Gr*. II p. 281. 15 Bachmann.

[2] *Herm*. 33, p. 522.

was cited as the source. Wilamowitz saw the importance of the text and used it to emend Rohde's Paradoxographus Vaticanus xxxiii [1]: Παρ' Ὁμήρῳ Πρωτεὺς εἰς πάντα μετεμορφοῦτο, καθὰ Θέτις παρὰ Πινδάρῳ καὶ Νηρεὺς παρὰ Στησιχόρῳ καὶ Μήστρα. Rzach also realized its significance and numbered it as fr. 112 b, therefore part of the story of Autolykos, who, as we have mentioned, is declared by Ovid to be Mestra's husband. At the same time Tzetzes' comment was still disregarded as fr. fals. 5b.

However Wilamowitz' text was careless. It was left to R. Philippson (*Herm.* 55 (1920), 260) to produce one better:
[Ἀχε-|λ]ώου καὶ πάν[των τῶν | ἀ]λ[ή]πτων θ[εῶν με-|τ]αμορφώσ[εις· ἔτι | δὲ πολυ[ει]δ[ίαν / π]αντελῶς τα[ύτην Πο-|σ]ειδῶν λέγετ[αι | τ]ῶν ἀνθρώπ[ων τι-|σ]ὶν περιθεῖν[αι τήν | τε αὐτὴν δ[οῦ]ναι | Περικλυμέ[νωι κ[αὶ | Μ]ήστραι· τούτων [δὲ | τὴν μὲν ἱστορε[ῖ γ'ἐν Ἠ-|οίαι]ς Ἡσίοδος 'δίχα | π]λασθῆναι' χάρ[ιν τοῦ | δι]ατρέφεσθ' Ạ[ἴθω-|να]· οὐδὲ γὰρ [εἰκὸς | μετασχ]ημα[τίζεσ-|θαι ἐ]τύμ[ως Περικλύ-|μενον].
This text was reasonably regarded by Scherling [2] as certain in all its essentials. It was of course unfortunate that the object of Mestra's care appeared in a lacuna. Where Wilamowitz had earlier read δι]ατρέφεσθα̣[ι (and at *Hell. Dicht.* II, p. 42 he suggests τὸν πατέρα as the supplement), Philippson supplied δι]ατρέφεσθ' Ạ[ἴθωνα. In consequence it was still possible to imagine that Philodemos pointed to a treatment of Aithon apart from Erysichthon. When scholars made statements such as 'The tale can be traced back no earlier than Hellanicus' [3] and 'How it was told and whether or not Hellanicus invented it we cannot know' [4], it is hard to determine whether the remarks are carefully phrased, to distinguish a Hesiodic treatment of Aithon from later treatment of Erysichthon, or whether the evidence has not been weighed at all.

Zielinski (2. 35 f.) and Wilamowitz [5] saw that Tzetzes' remark remained important. But whereas the latter realized that, if the use of αἴθων λιμός in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* was vindicated by

---

[1] O. Keller, *Rerum Naturalium Script. Graec. Minor.* I (Leipzig 1877), p. 110.

[2] *R.E.* xv, 1 (1931), 1289. I have made some remarks on the subject in *Mnem.* S. IV. 12 (1959), 198-203.

[3] H. J. Rose, *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (1949) *s.v.* Erysichthon. In his *Handbook of Greek Mythology*, p. 303 he shows knowledge of Hes. fr. 112 b (testimony of Philodemos), but at p. 101 refuses Hesiod the use of Erysichthon because of *Frag. fals.* 5 b (Tzetzes).

[4] L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (1939), p. 132.

[5] *Hell. Dicht.* II p. 39.

Philodemos' association of the story with Hesiod, we should consequently trust Tzetzes for the identification of Erysichthon and Aithon by 'Hesiod', Zielinski fought a stubborn rearguard action. To him the scholiast meant " *'Unser Erysichthon heisst bei Hesiod Aithon'*, d.h. 'Hesiod erzählt von seinem Aithon eine ähnliche Geschichte, wie sie sonst von Erysichthon erzählt wird' ".

On this point at least we now have clear guidance. In 1960 [1] J. Schwartz published *P.I.F.A.O.* 322, twelve fragments of a papyrus of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*. It was gratifying to find Mestra is represented. To prevent a hopeless tangle, it will be better to consider the importance of the papyrus when we turn to Mestra. At this point we are concerned rather with the identity of her father. Frag. A 18 f. is not explicit on the point: '(But when?) she bore a son to lord Poseidon, she was (not yet?) tending her hapless father' [2]. However B is more instructive:

ε]υ̣στέ̣φανος Πολυμήλη —
ος ἀντι]θ̣έοιο
]ο̣υ̣ Τριοπίδαο
Χαρίτων ἀ]μαρύγματ' ἔχουσα
ἐπ]ών[υ]μ[ο]ν εἵ̣ν̣εκα λιμοῦ
]θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων
αἴθω]να δ̣ὲ λ̣ι̣μὸν ἅπαντες
θ]νητο[ῖς] ἀνθρώποις
πυκι]νὰ [φ]ρ̣εσὶ μήδε' ἰ̣δ̣[υι.(.)
]θε . . [.] ν . γε περ̣ν[ας
γυ]ν̣αικῶν

Schwartz (p. 278) is inclined to take Polymele to be Erysichthon's wife. In the present state of our knowledge there is little that can be said either way on this point. But mention of 'the son of Triopas' must inevitably confirm the appearance of Erysichthon. Moreover Frag. A Col. 1 (of 25 lines) has at its end eight lines which coincide with the *Eoie* of Eurynome, known to us from *P. Oxy.* 421 and *P. Berl.* 7497. The Mestra episode therefore comes at the end of an *Eoie*, in all probability, as Schwartz (p. 280) saw, that of Kanake; the *Eoie* then concludes naturally in the

---

[1] *Pseudo-Hesiodeia* (Leiden, Brill), pp. 265-285, 601-3. It was unkind to make us wait from 1946 (p. 5).

[2] . . . .]πει τέκε πα[ῖ]δα⌋ Ποσε⌊ιδάωνι ἄνακτι
. . . . . αἰν]όμορον πατέρ⌋α δν π⌊ορσ[α]ίνεσκεν.

third generation with her grandson, Erysichthon. And lines 5-8 (possibly 5-9) testify to the accuracy of Tzetzes on this occasion. Erysichthon and Aithon are identified and the nickname explained, with some care it would seem (perhaps suggestive of an inventor), by invoking the expression αἴθων λιμός.

From the time of the *Catalogue* onwards, therefore, this association of ideas awaits Kallimachos' use. But it should also remind us that no author who may be thought to have handled the theme between the early date and the Hellenistic period can any longer be required to submit to our scepticism. The story now has good enough credentials for its use not to surprise.

The 'Aithon' of Achaios

I think that we are now entitled to approach the satyr-play of Achaios with a little more confidence. Of it we have but six fragments, five of them furnished by Athenaios. From the interests of the author of the *Deipnosophists* it is not surprising that these concern food and drink (7-9 = 5-7 Steffen), perfume (10 = 8 St.) and love (6 = 4 St.). We may imagine that a banquet featured in the story. The title of the play has of course been connected with Odysseus and Erysichthon [1]. The former's claims were supported by E. Müller [2], C. L. Urlichs [3] and Welcker [4]. Erysichthon, earlier favoured by Urlichs [5], has won the support of Creuzer, Köpke, Crenius, Crusius, Wagner, Aly, J. O. Schmidt and most recently V. Steffen [6].

The only fragment which we owe to another than Athenaios is rather special. It is preserved in Schol. Ar. *Ran.* 184 (fr. 11 = 9 St.):

Δημήτριός φησιν 'Αχαίου ὅλον εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ Αἴθωνος. λέγουσι δ' αὐτὸ οἱ σάτυροι [7],

χαῖρ' ὦ Χάρων, χαῖρ' ὦ Χάρων, χαῖρ' ὦ Χάρων,
ἦ που σφόδρα θυμοῖ;

[1] Sulzberger (*R.E.G.* 39 (1926), 444) made Aithon, son of Helios, the subject, connecting him with Odysseus' use of the name for good measure; he did not argue the point.

[2] *De Aethone satyrico Achaei Eretriensis*, Ratib. 1837.

[3] *Philol.* 1 (1846), 557-562.

[4] *Append. ad Tril.*, p. 317.

[5] *Achaei Eretriensis quae supersunt collecta et illustrata*, Bonn 1834, p. 43.

[6] *Satyrographorum Graecorum Fragmenta*², Poznan 1952, p. 236. Cf. also Zielinski 1. 146 n. 21; Wilamowitz, *Hell. Dicht.* II, p. 41: 'an appealing conjecture'.

[7] Bentley's certain emendation of τίτυροι.

Attempts to assign this fragment to another play (to Achaios' *Pirithous* by Wagner or to an *Aidoneus* presumed to be from the pen of Achaios of Syracuse by R. J. Walker) have not been convincing. We must consequently explain the descent to the underworld in relation to either Odysseus or Erysichthon. Now this may seem to settle the question, for there is no known association of the latter with Hades, while the former enjoys the support of the *Nekyia*. It is easy, as Urlichs has done, to make a happy reconstruction: Odysseus and his satyr band of companions undergo comic experiences in Hades through Circe's doing. In fr. 8 (6 St.) some have been changed into pigs; indeed the whole plot was perhaps an earlier form of the *Frogs*. And so on. But a good deal of logical underpinning is necessary before any such reconstruction is really worth the effort.

Urlichs rejected Erysichthon, 'cuius fabulae nescio quid foedi inest atque a dramatis elegantia alieni'. What role *elegantia* plays in a satyr-play he does not explain; it is more customary to consider such compositions as 'plays . . . dealing with grotesque portions of ancient legends, or dealing with the legends grotesquely' [1]. Moreover, Urlichs objects, Erysichthon has no dealings with Charon. But Crusius' comment should not be forgotten:

> '. . . sei hervorgehoben, dass Komödienhelden wiederholt in die Unterwelt steigen, lediglich wegen der dort gebotenen Gelegenheit, billig zu schmausen . . . : ein Motiv, welches sich für den verzweifelnden Erysichthon trefflich eignen würde'.

The hecatombs of oxen which passed into Hades would provide hungry Erysichthon with an excellent reason for paying a visit [2].

Perhaps there are two arguments which have carried more weight than others. The first is that the identification of Erysichthon

---

[1] Harvey, *Oxford Companion to Classical Literature s.v.* Satyric Dramas. I have already suggested that Mart. 12. 77 is modelled on the Aithon story. The subject of what was formerly 12. 78, but now *Suppositicia* 6 Schneidewin, is curious enough to be worth a mention here: 'Ante Iouis statuam crepuit satur *histrio*: poenam Iupiter indixit, uiuere de proprio'.

[2] Cf. Call. Epigr. 13. 5-6 εἰ δὲ τὸν ἡδὺν | βούλει, Πελλαίου βοῦς μέγας εἰν 'Αίδῃ; fr. 191. 2 ἐκ τῶν ὅκου βοῦν κολλύβου πιπρήσκουσιν; Pherekrates fr. 81 a, Edmonds I p. 236 ὀβολοῦ χίμαιρα· ἐν Αἵδου. The last is the reading of Photios. Edmonds gives ὀβολου † < . . . . > χίμαιρ' † ἐν Αἵδου ('You bought a goat for twopence down below?') and comments: 'If this emendation is right, the point is that obols are not current coin in Hades'. Surely the obol which was Charon's due would be the *only* coin current in Hades (hence the poet's introduction of 'flounders' and 'crumbs' as makeshift multiples of the obol?).

and Aithon is arbitrary, even though it already appears in Hellanikos. That the identification involves some semantic juggling is obvious, but we now see that it goes back to the Hesiodic *Catalogue*; we are no longer dealing with what may be thought to be a private judgment of Hellanikos, but with the great authority of the *Hesodeia*. If Aithon is a reference to Erysichthon-Aithon, Achaios has a respected source for the title. The second argument is that the *Nekyia* exercised a special authority. But against the relevance of this there are two important considerations. Firstly, as J. O. Schmidt [1] argues, it is hard to imagine why Odysseus (either *chez* Circe or in Hades) should preserve the fictitious name he assumed in the Cretan story. Secondly, while Odysseus' descent to the underworld occurs frequently enough, it cannot be shown that greater use is made of Odysseus as Aithon than of Erysichthon as Aithon. Theognis 1209, I have already suggested [2], is not evidence for Odysseus, but in fact neutral.

We should not forget that in the *Catalogue* it is Aithon, and not Erysichthon, that is interpreted. It should therefore not occasion surprise if the nickname chanced to stick in the memory and become the subject of a comic treatment. The case for Erysichthon-Aithon is now much stronger. He may, quite naturally, be imported into Hades by an enterprising poet either alive (cf. the *Frogs*) or in the normal manner after death. Herakles preserves his ravenous appetite after his apotheosis, according to Kallimachos (H. 3. 159 ff.), and Erysichthon's shade may still, in a poet's imagination, retain his *Heisshunger*. That he went while alive perhaps seems more likely, and the opinion might finally prove true that Aristophanes' play owes a good deal more than a borrowed line to Achaios' *Aithon*.

Perhaps fr. 47 (34 St.) deserves a special mention, although its connexion with the *Aithon* comes only through a suggestion by Friebel: χάσκοντα λιμῷ μόσχον ὡς χελιδόνος. We owe the verse principally to Eust. *Il.* 753, 55 and Ael. *N.A.* 7. 47, where the poet is criticized for rashness in using μόσχος as 'young' or 'offspring'. However if the subject is really Erysichthon, there would be special point in the image. Firstly, comic effect may be intended in the blending of the persistent demands of a fledgeling [3] with

[1] *Commentationes Philologae O. Ribbeck*, Leipzig 1888, pp. 112 ff.
[2] See p. 11.
[3] Cf. Anacreonta 25. 12 κεχηνότων νεοττῶν.

the bulk of a calf; that is to say, we would have a kind of παρὰ προσδοκίαν construction, as if a glutton can better be thought of as μόσχος rather than νεοττός, even in analogy! Secondly, it would not be impossible that the image owes something to βου-λιμία.

When I defend later in this study the proposition that Kallimachos is treating the Erysichthon story as comedy, we ought to remember that Achaios probably established a precedent for such a treatment.

There is one additional line of enquiry which does not seem to have been considered; it turns upon a chronological question. It is unfortunate that we do not know more about Achaios' dates of publication. We learn from the Suda that he was born in 484-1, that he began publishing during the 83rd Olympiad, *circa* 447. It has been concluded [1] from the absence of his name among the surviving tragedians in Aristophanes' *Frogs* that he was already dead at Ol. 93, 3 (406). Regrettably it is only in the same play that we hear of the *Aithon* as a source; we cannot therefore establish an earlier *terminus post quem non*. The *Aithon* then must fall between 447 and 406.

After his capture of Eion in 476-5 Kimon is reported to have set up an inscription on a stone Herm in the Stoa of Herms, and later to have added others after the victories of Eurymedon and Cyprus [2]. The Eion inscription is as follows:

ἦν ἄρα κἀκεῖνοι ταλακάρδιοι, οἵ ποτε Μήδων
παισὶν ἐπ' Ἠϊόνι Στρυμόνος ἀμφὶ ῥοὰς
λιμόν τ'αἴθωνα κρατερόν τ' ἐπάγοντες Ἄρηα
πρῶτοι δυσμενέων εὗρον ἀμηχανίην.

The inscription was still in existence in 330 (Aeschines), but of its subsequent history we know nothing; only the excavation of the north end of the Athenian Agora could throw light on such a question.

Whether the Eion inscription really was set up in 475 or whether all three were set up after the campaign at Cyprus in 450-449, is an oft-discussed question. H. T. Wade-Gery [3], following some viewpoints of v. Domaszewski [4], regarded the Eurymedon in-

[1] E.g. by Dieterich, *R.E.* i (1894), 207 f.

[2] Aeschin. III 184; Plut. *Cim.* 7. In line 3 κρατερόν is Aeschines' reading, while Plutarch has κρυερόν.

[3] *J.H.S.* 53 (1933), 71-95.

[4] SB Heid. 1914, Abh. 10, pp. 13-20.

scription as the earliest, in 468, for it 'reads as if written in the exaltation of the moment'[1]; in 449, after the Peace of Kallias and Kimon's death, the Eion-Herm and the Cyprus-Herm were added. From the Eion inscription he argued—straining the evidence—that ποτε in an epigram pointed to the past and that κἀκεῖνοι compared the victors of Eion with later victors. Although these latter points do not carry a good deal of weight and the particular order which Wade-Gery assumes has been challenged[2], there is often agreement that it is easier to explain, for example, πρῶτοι δυσμενέων εὗρον ἀμηχανίην[3] and indeed the tenor of the series, if they celebrate the end of the succession of Persian wars, the outstanding achievement of the Delian League[4].

'The Ἑρμαί at Athens, on which the epigrams were inscribed', remarked R. W. Macan[5], 'kept the Athenian side of the story green'. The Street and Stoa of Herms were familiar features of the Agora, and many an Athenian would have read the inscriptions *in situ*[6]. But he would have read, in addition to the proud story of Greek achievement, a reference to αἴθων λιμός. Here then, in a prominent position, was—during the period of Achaios' literary activity at Athens—an example of the phrase which was used by 'Hesiod' to explain the identification of Erysichthon and Aithon. Would it be rash to suggest that it might have had a contribution to make towards the ready comprehension of the basic idea behind Achaios' *Aithon* ?

Mestra

When Fr. A Col. 1 of *P.I.F.A.O.* 322[7] opens, Sisyphos, father of Glaukos, is under discussion:

---

1 *Op. cit.* p. 91 f.

2 This extends also to the precise limits of each epigram.

3 The really striking thing about this expression is that the victors are elevated to the position of πρῶτοι εὑρεταί. A. Kleingünther, ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΕΥΡΕΤΗΣ (Philol. Supplbd. xxvi, 1 1933) does not discuss this example. For the expression cf. already *Phoronis* fr. 2 Kinkel (on the Idaian Daktyls) οἱ π ρ ῶ τ ο ι τέχνην πολυμήτιος Ἡφαίστοιο | ε ὗ ρ ο ν (Kleingünther, pp. 26 f.). This pays high praise to the victors of Eion, and also to their achievement, for the discovery that the overwhelming strength of the Persian invaders could be rendered ineffectual is here cast in a very concrete mould.

4 Cf. Friedländer, *Stud. ital. d. filol. cl.* 15 (1938), 102-8; Gomme, *Commentary on Thucydides I* (1945), pp. 288 f.

5 *Herodotus VII-IX*, Vol. I Pt. I (1908), p. 136.

6 Cf. Harrison-Verrall, *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens*, pp. 131 f.; R. Martin, *Recherches sur l'agora grecque* (Paris 1951), pp. 191 ff., 320 ff.

7 *Pseudo-Hesiodeia*, pp. 266 f., 273 f.

'He excelled the rest of mankind in intelligence and wisdom, but by no means did he know the plan of Zeus who bears the aegis, that the gods on high would not grant him that Glaukos should leave through Mestra progeny among men. Poseidon the Earthshaker tamed her, taking her far away from her father over the wine-dark sea to sea-girt Kos, despite her wiles. There she bore Eurypylos, leader of many folk . . . she bore a son of exceptional strength who had as sons Chalkon and Antagoras. The valiant son of Zeus (Herakles) ravaged the lovely capital of their realm and destroyed the villages... when he came from Troy... because of the horses of Laomedon . . . he killed the overweening Giants . . . She (Mestra) leaving Kos . . . returned to her native land, < while Poseidon went? > [1] to the hills of Athens . . . she bore a son to lord Poseidon <but not yet? > was she tending her ill-fated father.'

Since the *Eoie* of Eurynome follows, it is clear that the story of Mestra's support of Erysichthon has already been told [2].

In the Ovidian account of Mestra [3] she is sold by her father to provide him with food. Since she had earlier been raped by Poseidon, she obtained from the seagod the gift of metamorphosis, changing first into a fisherman to escape her owner and subsequently, after each sale, into animal form. Her efforts however were inadequate for Erysichthon's needs. We are also led to believe that she finally married Autolykos, and this union presumably was the reason for her failure.

We are of course bound to ask how much of this is original. Since Kallimachos finds special reasons for suppressing the Mestra episode, we were forced, before the appearance of the Hesiodic papyrus, to lean heavily upon the information provided by Lykophron, Tzetzes' commentary on the *Alexandra* and Antoninus Liberalis. Lykophron (1394 ff.) described her as τῆς παντομόρφου βασσάρας λαμπουρίδος | . . . . . ἥτ' ἀλφαῖσι ταῖς καθ' ἡμέραν | βούπειναν ἀλθαίνεσκεν ἀκμαίαν πατρός. Λαμπουρίς testifies to Mestra's guile, but mention of 'her daily profits' and the description of her as βασσάρα ('fox')—a word with the secondary meanings of 'impudent woman, courtesan' [4]—make it possible that Euhemerism is already at work;

---

[1] I make this suggestion because it is easier to imagine why Poseidon should have an interest in Athens than what Mestra would be doing there. The son of Kekrops was Erysichthon of Prasiai, who has early and mysterious relations with Delos, but it would be too much to hope that the author has reason to bind the two stories together, particularly in this casual fashion.

[2] Fr. B. 10]θε . . [.]ν . γε περν[ας seems to refer to the sale of Mestra. The order seems to be B-C-A (*Pseudo-Hesiodeia*, p. 280), that is Erysichthon/ Aithon—the cheating of Sisyphos—flashback to Poseidon.

[3] *Met.* 8. 847-874.

[4] Cf. L-S-J. *s.v.* who cite this passage and also Lyc. 771.

this is certainly the case in Palaiphatos [1] (or rather the late epitome which has come down to us), where Mestra's metamorphosis into cow, dog or bird is dismissed as laughable, and the animals in question are accordingly turned into gifts from her suitors. The paraphrase of Lykophron which is published in Scheer's edition (I p. 111) uses the words τῆς κατωφεροῦς ἑταιρίδος καὶ πόρνης ἀλώπεκος. This may already be the approach of Lykophron, but Tzetzes at least is more respectful of the tradition when he describes Erysichthon's daughter as φαρμακίς, 'who used to change into every form of animal'.

Antoninus Liberalis (17. 5) includes only a short mention, but one of considerable importance: Ὑπερμήστραν πιπρασκομένην ἐπὶ γυναικὶ μὲν ἄρασθαι τῖμον, ἄνδρα δὲ γενομένην Αἴθωνι τροφὴν ἀποφέρειν τῷ πατρί. The name Hypermestra seems a simple mistake, but the statement that Mestra appeared in *male* form (as in Ovid, *Met.* 8. 853-4 *uultumque uirilem induit*) can be no error, for it is the reason for mention of the lady at all. Ἄρασθαι τῖμον, as has long been observed, implies a poetic source for the reference, and the summary treatment of Mestra in Ovid himself (for she is only an excuse to tell the story of Erysichthon in a work devoted to metamorphoses) suggests a Hellenistic intermediary, by whom the tale was told in greater detail. It is unfortunate that the authority of the testimony is not quite clear. Antoninus is telling the story of Galateia, which an ascription at the head of the chapter connects with Nicander's *Heteroiumena* Bk. II. These ascriptions seem ultimately to derive from a work by Pamphilos [2]. They are hardly more of a guarantee that Antoninus has drawn on the source mentioned when only one work is listed than when several are mentioned [3]. But even if we could be confident that this is Nicander's story of Galateia, does the reference to Mestra also come from the same poet?

In the context Galateia prays to Leto to change the sex of her

[1] *De incred.* 25 (24), *Mythographi Graeci* III. 2. Apostolios XI. 22 (Leutsch-Schneidewin, *Paroemiogr. gr.* II p. 520) uses Palaiphatos when explaining a proverb of unknown age, Μεταβλητότερος Μήτρας.

[2] See Wentzel, *R.E.* i (1894), 2572 f.

[3] Cf. W. Vollgraff, *Nikander und Ovid* (1909) I p. 28: 'Wenn wir zum Beispiel zu der Geschichte des Battos (23) notiert finden, sie stehe, nach dem Zeugniss des Pamphilos, bei Nikander, Hesiodos, Didymarchos, Antigonos und Apollonios, so hatte selbstverständlich jeder der hier genannten fünf Schriftsteller den Mythus in seiner Art, das heisst wieder in einer etwas anderen Fassung als seine Vorgänger erzählt'.

female child, to save its life from the father's wrath. With a καθάπερ ὅτε follow references to the changes of sex of Kainis-Kaineus, Teiresias, (Hyper)mestra and Siproites of Crete. Hercher[1] and Wilamowitz[2] regard the learned enumeration as an interpolation, an interruption to the narrative perhaps to be ascribed to Antoninus himself. This conclusion has often been attacked[3]. Zielinski (2. 13 n. 1) especially found it *anathema*. To him the enumeration imitated such passages as *Il.* 5. 385 ff. and 14. 317 ff. Antoninus exploited a very small circle of authors, and both he and Ovid made considerable use of Nicander. It was scarcely credible that Nicander omitted all three stories, and significant that all three appear in Ovid. Curiously Zielinski forgets as easily as mythology has done the fourth story of Siproites, who underwent a change of sex when he saw Artemis bathing; this lapse of memory must damage the effectiveness of the last-mentioned arguments.

We may say at the beginning that the learned enumeration is thoroughly Hellenistic, that Zielinski may be right in a second line of defence, that, if Nicander is not the source, then it is an anonymous Hellenistic one. If it is reasonable to believe that it is a poetic source, and a Greek one, we have said a good deal. The uncertainty is annoying because of the tenses of γενομένην . . . . . ἀποφέρειν. Zielinski (1. 149) curiously regards 'Nicander' as corroboration for his idea that the Ovidian story is contaminated with a version in which a *single* act of metamorphosis took place; for all we know at present the tense may point in a different direction, to an antecedent version in which a change of sex is a regular feature. But we may go a little further on the question of source. In Ovid, from the second sale onwards, Mestra assumes animal form (*Met.* 8. 873 'Nunc equa, nunc ales, modo bos modo ceruus abibat'). *Ceruus*, I think, points to a Greek original. The word already worried Zielinski (1. 140 n. 8), who argued firstly that there was no

[1] *Herm.* 12 (1877), 318.

[2] *Hell. Dicht.* II, p. 41 n. 2.

[3] E.g. by Rohde, *Der gr. Roman und seine Vorläufer*, p. 99; E. Bethe, *Herm.* 39 (1904), 7; Lafaye, p. 133 n. 4. (Korn-) Ehwald (4th edtn. 1916) *ad Met.* 8. 874 would go as far as to reconstruct the original *with the help of Ovid*: αἰὲν 'Υπερμνήστρην ἄρασθαι τῖμον ἀεικῆ, (cf. *non iusta*, Ov.) | ἄνδρα δὲ γινομένην Αἴθωνι τροφὴν ἀπενεῖκαι. There is a certain amount of optimism shown here. Rohde's suggestion that we see in the text of Antoninus the use by Nicander of parallel myths which had been handled by other authors is the most serious argument to date; he compares *Ciris* 238, Ap. Rhod. III. 997 ff., Q. Smyrn. 10. 479 ff., Musaios 153 ff., Propert. V 4, 39 ff.

occasion for a change of sex—and *ceruus* is not an Epicoenum—, secondly that Mestra must return to her father, not merely leave her masters. Hence he would read *modo cerua redibat.* The second change is special pleading, forced upon him for metrical reasons, and we must be prepared to allow Ovid to tell his own story. The first change is unnecessary, although at the same time we ought not to attach any significance to the use of the masculine gender in the text, such as Prof. G. B. Riddehough [1] is inclined to do:

> 'She (Mestra) becomes, among other things, a mare and a stag-evidently not being subject to any limitations as governed certain Celtic magicians of long ago, who, whatever their sex as human beings, had in the animal-shape to be female'.

It seems to me more likely that behind *ceruus* we should see ἔλαφος, an Epicoenum in the Greek original.

Crusius, supported by Zielinski (I. 145, 149 ff.), has doubted that Ovid presents the original version of the tale when he introduces Mestra in animal form *after* she has been sold, instead of before. It is interesting to notice that occasionally the natural order is unconsciously taken for granted: 'Erysichthon, father of Mestra . . ., whom in order to appease his insatiable hunger he sold to different masters in turn, according as she changed herself into a bird, an ox, etc.' [2]. But Ovid does not really say this, and we must conclude that the story has undergone manipulation, for the feature is unmotivated in Ovid. To assume animal shape while fleeing from a master does seem to involve Mestra in unnecessary risk, and it must have been another who had made this serve a purpose.

There is at any rate a reasonable possibility that the change of sex was a part of an earlier treatment of Mestra. From the new Hesiodic papyrus we see that the liaison with Poseidon is certainly early. This incident is, as Schwartz [3] remarks, merely 'une fugue sans conséquence' in Fr. A. Mestra is sold during her father's *Heisshunger*; 'il faut admettre qu'elle rentre heureusement chez son père'. Sisyphos seeks her for his son, Glaukos, but does not succeed. 'La seule progéniture que Mestra devait avoir était Eurypyle, né

---

[1] *Phoenix* 13 (1959), 205.

[2] J. H. Mozley, Loeb edition of Ovid's *Ibis* (1929), p. 285 n. 6. The same assumption occurs three times in Dawkins, *Forty Five Stories from the Dodecanese*, pp. 347 (*bis*), 349. It is unfortunate that Tzetzes *ad* Lycophr. 1393 ff. is vague: ἐπίπρασκε γὰρ αὐτὴν . . . . . ἡ δὲ πάλιν ἀμείβουσα τὸ εἶδος φεύγουσα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἤρχετο.

[3] *Pseudo-Hesiodeia*, p. 280.

avant tous ces événements'. That is to say, the Poseidon affair is only connected with the opening lines of the fragment insofar as it tells us, if not Glaukos, who *had* 'left seed among men from Mestra', namely Poseidon.

The complicating factor is the detail of fr. A 7, that Poseidon takes Mestra to Kos καίπερ πολύιδριν ἐοῦσαν. Schwartz (p. 279), suggesting that fr. C (a not very informative series of broken lines, with the exception of 4 ἀπά]τησε πολύφρονά [πε]ρ μάλ' ἐοντ[α) is the scene where crafty Sisyphos tries to arrange the marriage for Glaukos, and is earlier than fr. A, asked whether Mestra was already celebrated for her talent for metamorphosis. If this section does in fact follow the feeding of her father, then the conclusion is natural, and does not need Schwartz' hopeful suggestion that]ετο τε[at C 1 should be compared with *Od.* 4. 455 οὐδ' ὁ γέρων δολίης ἐπελήθετο τέχνης, of the versatile Proteus. It remains unfortunate that the only reference to metamorphosis in the Hesiodic treatment of Mestra is the unexpected, but defensible, δίχα πλασθῆναι of Philodemos [1], an expression which is as appropriate for change of sex as for wider metamorphosis. But we should particularly like to know whether she possessed the gift, in whichever form, before the decline of her father.

Zielinski [2] believed that Ovid had contaminated two forms of the Mestra story, one in which Mestra, like her linguistic congener Medea, had an hereditary gift of transformation, another in which she obtains the gift of a single act of metamorphosis through the favour of Poseidon. He would find evidence for the former stratum in Ovid's mention of Mestra's *ius*, 'Recht', at *Met.* 8. 730, 738 f., as opposed to 848 and 870, in which Poseidon takes the initiative [3]. It must be left to the reader to decide whether *Macht* would still not be better than *Recht* for Ovid's *ius*, even if the occurrence of Poseidon in the early version would not now require us to find in Ovid evidence of the *pre*-Hesiodic tradition, rather too much to hope.

The evidence of Philodemos was able to be explained away by

[1] See p. 20. Philippson also considered the possibility of a verb of selling (comparing Ovid's *hanc quoque uendit inops. Met.* 8. 848), but nothing better than π]ρα[[σ]]θῆναι suggested itself.

[2] 1. 148-9. He is supported by, for example, M. Ninck, *Die Bedeutung des Wassers im Kult und Leben der Alten* (Philol. Supplbd. xiv, 2 1921), p. 144 n. 7.

[3] Zielinski started with the belief that the love interest with Poseidon already stamped that version as the younger (1. 149), but at 2. 17 n. 1 he dropped the argument.

Zielinski [1]. The single favour of his second story appeared there, as well as in 'Nicander', for διχ. | κασθῆναι (as Wilamowitz had read it) was merely a corruption of ἀνδρὶ εἰκασθῆναι; moreover, when Philodemos opposes Mestra to Periklymenos with a τὴν μέν, he could draw the conclusion: 'Nun war diesem die Gabe unbeschränkter Transformität gegeben—der Mestra also nicht'. Of course there is special pleading here; there may be any number of reasons for τὴν μέν, such as the purpose for which the gift was given by Poseidon, or no reason at all. And the evidence of Philodemos, according to Philippson's reading, is against Zielinski's emendation. But since we do not yet know what form the gift took in 'Hesiod' (from either Philodemos or the papyrus), and are invited by Schwartz to the conclusion that the gift was acquired early, Zielinski's idea of conflation acquires a new lease of life; the more so because

> 'Cette histoire d'Érysichthon amenée par le déroulement normal des généalogies s'est donc augmentée d'un certain nombre d'épisodes: l'histoire même de Mestra est déjà une surcharge; celle de Sisyphe l'est encore plus nettement; celle des amours avec Poséidon en est une troisième, pour ne pas parler des exploits d'Héraclès à Cos.'

Now if there is a lost section of the *Catalogue* which links fr. C. to A, covering the thwarting of Sisyphos by Mestra, and these sections themselves are later than the treatment of Erysichthon's *Heisshunger*, we are of course inclined to see metamorphosis as the means that the daughter employed. But at the same time we have the embarrassment of the reference to her cunning at the time of the liaison with Poseidon, indeed also the manner itself in which the incident is mentioned. Precisely because of A 18 f., where the rape is placed before the feeding of her father, we do not expect that Mestra's relationship with Poseidon has already been made the basis of her gift of metamorphosis. A 5-19 tell the story as if it is being told for the first time; unless there is some repetition or a summary earlier treatment on this point, it may be that it was left to a later poet to make this association. In other words, the Hesiodic account may credit Mestra with an earlier gift of metamorphosis from Poseidon, in the unmotivated manner in which it was given to Periklymenos, ᾧ πόρε δῶρα Ποσειδάων Ἐνοσίχθων παντοῖα [2]. The description of Mestra as already πολύιδρις at the time of the abduction would then have to convey a good deal.

---

[1] 2. 35 f.

[2] Hes. fr. 14. 2-3.

This is, of course, not the only possibility as far as πολύιδρις is concerned. The word may not imply metamorphosis at that time at all, but Mestra may be πολύιδρις in the same sense in which Sisyphos is πολύφρων (C 4), excels men in cunning (A 1), indeed is himself later described as πολύιδρις [1]. Or the thought may simply reflect a tidy attitude of mind; the poet has spoken of Mestra's cunning in dealing with Sisyphos, and now, with disregard for the time factor, says that cunning did not save her on the earlier occasion. We therefore reach, as is to be expected, an *impasse*. The change of sex and the presence of Poseidon appear in Greek versions, but details of the receipt of the gift, and the gift itself, still escape us. We see in the Hesiodic treatment that clash of wits which the Greeks enjoyed, also to occur in the famous dispute between Autolykos and Sisyphos [2] and hardly to be divorced from the association of Autolykos and Mestra, which turns the wheel full circle. It grows clearer, however, that the complications of the story have set in early, and that Ovid inherited a theme of long standing. While there is still another source of information to throw some light on both the Ovidian treatment of Erysichthon and Mestra and the Callimachean treatment of Erysichthon, it will add to, rather than simplify, the complexities of the tale.

II: ERYSICHTHON AND MESTRA ON KOS

'Of few ancient deities has popular memory been more tenacious than of Demeter', wrote J. C. Lawson [3]. A good illustration of the truth of this statement is a folktale recorded by Jacob Zarraftis on W. J. D. Rouse's behalf [4] from an old woman of Asphendiou on the island of Kos. It was first published, after a gap of more than forty years, by R. M. Dawkins in *Forty Five Stories from the Dodecanese* [5]. The tale is unique in the collection since it is the only one for which Zarraftis named his source, moreover the only one which

[1] See Schwartz, *op. cit.* pp. 272 n. 1, 559, 560 f.
[2] See Schwartz, *op. cit.* pp. 441 ff.
[3] *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, p. 79.
[4] Rouse referred to Zarraftis' material in *Folklore* 10 (1899), 150 ff. and 16 (1905), 17.
[5] Dawkins gave a summary in *Folklore* 53 (1942), 11-16 and discussed a point or two in 59 (1948), 55-8. There is a subsequent brief allusion to it in Dawkins' *More Greek Folk-tales* (1955), pp. 17 f.

was given a title by his source[1]. It would be outstanding in any collection, for it shows the transmission of an ancient tale over at least 2200 years.

This folktale is not yet well enough known for us to be able to dispense with a summary. The king of Myrmidonià, enamoured of a beautiful local girl named Dimitroula, is repulsed by her, for she is in love with a ploughman, whom the king in consequence tries to kill. After two vain attempts he sets an ambush in a beautiful grove, to which he has invited the ploughman to wrestle with one of his men. Dimitroula's intuition tells her that something is amiss, but both go, the girl hiding in a tree to watch the contest. It takes three volleys of arrows to bring low the ploughman, but in the process the king falls down a disused well. His minions, clustering around the old well, are set upon by the ploughman, momentarily revived, and fall in and drown. One survivor, who darkly hints at some kinship between Dimitroula and the spirits of the wood, takes the news to the king's son and then drops dead. In his fury the son swears that he will cut down the grove, so that the spirits 'should from that time onwards be done away from there for ever' (p. 336).

A giant oak is the focal point of his attack. It emits groans and sheds blood. When it falls a voice threatens the son with thrice worse punishment than his father suffered. Hereupon a girl's head is seen within the stump and the son flees in terror with all his servants, save one who discovers that Dimitroula has fallen down inside the hollow oak and is now approaching death. She curses the king's son with death by ravening hunger. That night while he sleeps a fairy gives him a foretaste of his future suffering with a dream picture of fire, cold and pain. Then Hunger herself appears and leaves her mark upon the wretch. Awakening he consumes all the food available, so that after several years he is impoverished. Only his son and daughter remain to be sold. Disposal of his son provides him with sustenance for a few days, but his daughter

[1] The informant's name is given as Hadzi-Yavrouda. An attempt to trace her descendants through the Hadzi-Yavroudi's at Pyli, near Asphendiou, proved unsuccessful. If the tale has already been effaced by the disturbances which the island has suffered during the past fifty years it would be a great pity. There are features which might well be illuminated by hearing the story a second time. The name given to the story was *Myrmidonià and Pharaonià*, but Dawkins' suggested alternative, *The Fairy's Revenge*, is bound to prove more popular.

cannot find a buyer. In desperation he tries to eat her, but she is rescued by her brother in the nick of time. 'Then he began to tear at his own flesh and to eat it, insomuch that he died, his very nails actually in his mouth' (p. 340).

The subsequent career of the daughter does not concern us here, for it has been recognized as an independent tale of wide currency [1]. The story outlined above is of course that of Erysichthon and Mestra.

The rarity of such direct transmissions from antiquity induced Professor Dawkins to use very guarded language in detail, although he subscribes to the view that the story is a genuine survival, as do Sir William Halliday [2] and C. A. Trypanis [3], among others. 'The names of the kingdoms, Myrmidonià and Pharaonià, of course suggest the land of the Myrmidons and Egypt, but they can hardly have any very definite intention; they are simply romantic names like Ruritania', wrote Dawkins (p. 346). Elsewhere [4] he spoke more forcefully on the point: 'I think any real connexion with the Myrmidons who attended upon Achilles unlikely in the last degree'. Again, 'that the modern heroine is called Dimitroula is certainly notable, yet is not a point on which I should lay very much stress: the name might well be, as it was certainly taken by those who heard the story, a feminine diminutive of Dimitrios, and have no connexion at all with Demeter' (p. 348) [5]. I have no brief to present for the antiquity of the name Pharaonià, which refers to the scene of the appended story, but Myrmidonià is very much to the point. Although Dawkins was well aware of the Thessalian associations of the folktale, he overlooked the fact, to which we have already alluded, that in the account given by Hellanikos Erysichthon is the son of a colourless Myrmidon [6]. The Myrmidons who live in Pelasgic Argos [7] are Thessalians, and Myrmidonia in the folktale faithfully connects the story with its early locale.

---

[1] See Dawkins, p. 347.
[2] *Folklore* 66 (1955), 300.
[3] *J.H.S.* 73 (1953), 197.
[4] *Folklore* 53 (1942), 12.
[5] Dimitroula is the only character named in the first tale. In the 'modern' supplement we meet Tartana and Eftakipis, names which can be explained as special inventions (Dawkins, p. 346). In the case of Dimitroula I imagine that its kinship with Dimitrios helped to preserve it during the long history of the folktale.
[6] See p. 8.
[7] Cf. p. 73.

The factors which make it reasonable that the story should have survived on Kos, and the general parallels between the ancient versions and the modern allow us, I think, to override Dawkins' qualms about Dimitroula. I have not the temerity to challenge his acquaintance with Greek folklore, but his unfamiliarity with the Erysichthon story often led him into error in insignificant detail and generally led him to underestimate the number of significant points of contact. There are considerations which make the association of this story with Kos particularly significant. Nearby was Knidos with the Triopion [1], of which Triopas was the traditional founder, and where the cultus of Demeter seems to have been consolidated by him in expiation for the family's misdeeds. Kos was a member of the Doric Hexapolis (later Pentapolis) along with Knidos [2], and Triopas appeared in local mythology [3]. The cautionary tale would have been congenial on an island which from at least the fifth century exacted a heavy penalty from any who cut down cypresses in the *temenos* of Asklepios [4] and which, when P. Turullius was murdered on Kos by order of Augustus, was prepared to attribute his death to Asklepios' displeasure at the destruction of his grove for boatbuilding [5]. There are other considerations with an especially important character. Two groups on Kos had a prominent interest in Demeter, on the one hand the Pamphyloi among the Doric tribes [6], on the other the descendants of Chalkon and Antagoras (ἀφ' ὧν οἱ ἐν Κῷ εὐγενεῖς), who are declared to have entertained Demeter during her quest for Persephone [7]. Both of these groups could have helped to preserve the story in ancient times. And now, lo and behold, from the new Hesiodic papyrus we discover that Mestra bore Thessalos on Kos, and his sons were Chalkon and Anta-

[1] See, for example, Theocr. 17. 66 ff. For the connexions of Kos with Thessaly, cf. Paton-Hicks, *The Inscriptions of Cos* (Oxford 1891), pp. xiv f., 344-8.

[2] Hdt. 1. 144.

[3] Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Μέροψ (Triopas, father of Merops of Kos); Schol. Theocr. 17. 68 (Triops as king of Kos). In Moschos, *Epitaph. Bionis* 98 f. (intruded lines) the citizens of Kos are called Τριόπιδαι.

[4] Segre, *Riv. Ist. Arch.* 6 (1937/8), 191-8; A. Laumonier, *Les cultes indigènes en Carie* (Paris 1958), p. 691.

[5] Dio Cass. LI 8; Val. Max. I i 19; Lact. *Inst.* II 8.

[6] Collitz III i. 3638 = J. de Prott, *Leges Graecorum Sacrae* I (1896) no. 7 pp. 27 f.; Paton-Hicks, *op. cit.*, pp. 341 ff.

[7] Schol. Theocr. 7. 4. One may suspect that for both the descent of the noble families and for the favour of Demeter Philitas was the island's propagandist.

goras [1]. It is hard to believe that a story could have survived with happier auspices.

Many of the features of the Coan congener call for special attention.

The Culprit

It is firstly interesting that both father and son are depicted as transgressors. In the dominant ancient version it was the son alone who offended, but mention has already been made of a version known to Diodoros Siculus, Hyginus and Marcellus of Side [2], in which Triopas himself was credited with a misdeed. The antiquity of this story cannot unfortunately be estimated. Since Marcellus' poem was commissioned by Herodes, himself no mean scholar, for his Roman Triopium, it has been concluded [3] that Knidos recognized Triopas as the culprit; but direct evidence is completely lacking. Diodoros' version (V. 61. 2) makes no mention of Demeter's wrath: ἐνταῦθα δὲ τὸ τέμενος τῆς Δήμητρος ἐκκόψαντα τῇ μὲν ὕλῃ καταχρήσασθαι πρὸς βασιλείων κατασκευήν. δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγχωρίων μισηθέντα, φυγεῖν ἐκ Θετταλίας . . . This has been held to guarantee the early date of his source [4], but unfortunately this does not follow. No author ever compiled a history with more reckless use of scissors and paste. Besides, this is a version in which the migration from Thessaly is not *au premier plan*. Triopas *of Rhodes*, involved in the murder of his brother Tenage, fled to the Cnidian Chersonnese, thence to Thessaly and finally, after his misdemeanour there, returned to Knidos. While parts of the episode seem ancient, we are handicapped by the fact that the story in this form clearly serves the interests of the Rhodian hegemony, issuing a counterblast to the established Thessalian tradition. We can therefore say no more than that the version existed in Greece. But this is probably to say enough to legitimize the possibility that the joint responsibility outlined in the Coan tale is an adaptation of two ancient

---

[1] J. Schwartz, *Pseudo-Hesiodeia*, p. 275, was presumably not aware of the existence of this folktale when he wrote: 'Mais Mestra n'a pas laissé de traces sensibles à Cos; aussi la fait-on revenir chez elle, avec une allusion obscure à Athènes'.

[2] See p. 17.

[3] Cf. Preller, *Griech. Myth.*, I. 638; Kuiper, *Studia Callimachea* II p. 45: 'Triopan (sive Erysichthona, nam idem apud Cnidios fuit)'.

[4] See Cahen, *Comm.*, p. 262 and *Call.*, p. 365; Rose, *Handbook of Greek Mythology*, p. 101 n. 76.

versions in which culpability was assigned to a single person. The tale in fact shows something of an interest in the dramatic possibilities of hereditary guilt [1].

The Ploughman

Dimitroula is in love with a young ploughman, 'a very handsome youth, hardworking and the richest man in the land' (p. 334). One hardly needs to be reminded of Demeter's love for the industrious agriculturalist εἰς ἄφενος σπεύδοντα [2]. But to say that the young ploughman is 'a typical hero of these stories' [3] is to forget that Erysichthon was interpreted by the ancients as 'he who tears up the earth', 'the ploughman', for Lykophron (*Alex.* 1396) paraphrases his name as ὀθνεῖα γατομοῦντος Αἴθωνος πτερῷ [4]. Perhaps here we

---

[1] In the pendent *Pharaonia* tale the son in his misery exclaims: 'Ah, Dimitroula, what harm have we unfortunates done to you that the wrong done you has reached even to us?' (Dawkins, p. 344). Cf. Croesus on the pyre (Hdt. 1. 86).

[2] Hes. *Op.* 24; cf. 299-301 and, for a noteworthy late example, Page, *Greek Literary Papyri*, no. 140 a, 87: ἵδρει γειοπόνῳ νυμφεύεται ὄμπνια Δηώ.

[3] Dawkins, *Folklore* 53 (1942), 12.

[4] Erysichthon is now generally interpreted in this way, as *Erdaufreisser*, a personified ploughman; for example, by Ch. Picard, *B.C.H.* 40 (1927), 333 n. 2 and *Rev. hist.* 166 (1931), 28, 44 n. 1. Zielinski (1. 160 ff.) spoke against it, through his belief that Erysichthon is an hypostasis of Poseidon, emerging from a cult title (cf. Ἐνοσίχθων, Σεισίχθων, Ἐλελίχθων, Δαμασίχθων), just as Halirrhothios is born from Poseidon Halirrhothios (reasonable although Pind. *O.* 10. 70 Snell is no longer evidence for it). We can only ask why Poseidon Erys. has disappeared, while his other similar cult titles survive. E. Will, *Korinthiaka* (Paris 1955), p. 159, mentions Pos. Erys., but this seems to be in simple error. Wüst (*R.E.* xxii, 1 (1953), 493 ff.) does not list it among the god's *Beinamen*.

The only extant example of ἐρυσίχθων as an adjective is found in Straton's *Phoinikides* (Kock *C.A.F.* iii. 361, Edmonds II 580 ff.), but in the text of Athenaios (IX 382 b ff.), not that of the new papyrus (Guéraud-Jouguet, *Un livre d'écolier*, Cairo 1938, pp. 35 ff.; Page, *Gk. Lit. Pap.*, pp. 260 ff.), where ῥηξίχθων occurs. Before we can use the reference we must first decide whether both Athenaios and the papyrus give the text of Straton (Athenaios in an enlarged version), or whether one of the two texts is really from Philemon (for Athen. XIV 659 b ascribes the first three lines also to him). Only then can we decide whether ἐρυσίχθων is a late intrusion into the text used by Athenaios, or the improvement of Straton upon Philemon's ῥηξίχθων. I prefer the latter idea, which was suggested by T. B. L. Webster (*Studies in Later Greek Comedy*, p. 145) for the relationship in general. Webster does not raise the specific question of ἐρυσίχθων. M. Treu, *Philol.* 102 (1958), 221 and 235, challenges Webster but does not convince me. After all this it would still remain to be decided whether ἐρυσίχθων referred to an ox or a pig. Perhaps this question deserves to be reopened later, but it is obviously not something on which one can lean heavily.

have a displaced feature. As Dawkins notes in another connexion: 'The tellers know that some certain element ought to be in the story, but are not sure how it should be placed, and so work it in some new way' (p. 348). Kallimachos mentions the high esteem in which the House of Triopas was originally held; Demeter was as passionately fond (ἐπεμαίνετο) of Dotion as of Eleusis, and of Triopas as of the nymph Enna (H. 6. 29-30), a situation surely reflected in the intimate expression τέκνον πολύθεστε τοκεῦσι at line 47 [1]. E. Wüst [2] has already attached great importance to this reference to Triopas, and scholars are also prepared in the case of Erysichthon to find a love motif modelled on the Iasion story: 'La colère de la Déméter thessalienne porte en fait les marques d'un dépit amoureux' [3]. Be that as it may, a narrator faced with seemingly conflicting pictures of Demeter's love and hatred for the same House may well have resolved the problem, consciously or unconsciously, by differentiating hero and villain.

The Pious Servant

It is worth noting that the Coan story features the Ovidian oak; we shall later discuss the special reason for Kallimachos' deviation from tradition with his poplar. The oak groans as in Ovid (*Met.* 8. 758), bleeds as in Ovid (762). And these apparently commonplace features are followed in both authors by a reference the importance of which was not grasped by Dawkins. When the blood spurts from the oak, the servants drop their axes and recoil in horror. Furiously Erysichthon (that is, the king's son) bids them strike again, and 'because they were afraid of him they *all* began again. *One alone hesitated*, for the blood was running in front of him.'

---

1 Cf. the contexts of *Od.* 19. 403 f. (πολυάρητος), Himer. *or.* 23. 20 Colonna (πολύευκτος), H. H. *Dem.* 165, 219 f. (πολυεύχετος, πολυάρητος). Cf. also Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* 1. 122 'Hennaeae Cereri *proles optata* uirebat/ unica' and Polyaratos and Polyeuktos as proper names.

2 *R.R.* vii A, i (1939), 174. 27 ff.

3 Picard, *B.C.H.* 40 (1927), 346 (cf. 345). Erysichthon as 'the ploughman' reminds us that the furrowing and insemination of the earth can be regarded as either courtship *or* outrage (Lenormant, Daremberg-Saglio, *s.v.* Ceres, col. 1038 b). Cf. the union of peasant piety and literary artifice in Columella *R.R.* x. 58 ff., where the farmers are instructed not to be afraid of digging the earth from the idea that they are attacking their mother, for they are not of the race which Prometheus formed of clay, but of men who sprang from the stones of Deukalion (cf. on this point Fontenrose, *Univ. Calif. Publ. in Class. Phil.* 13 (1944-50), 115 and n. 93). Hence (69 f.) 'curui uomere dentis/ iam uirides lacerate comas, iam scindite amictus'.

(p. 337) And then the oak fell. Here Ovid (765-9) preserves a fuller version and shows us the motivation for the hesitation which is so pointless in the Coan tale:

> 'Obstipuere omnes; aliquis ex omnibus audet
> deterrere nefas, saeuamque inhibere bipennem.
> aspicit hunc 'mentis' que 'piae cape praemia' dixit
> Thessalus inque uirum conuertit ab arbore ferrum,
> detruncatque caput. [1].

Ovid spares no feature which will intensify the picture of Erysichthon as the αὐθαδὴς ἀνήρ; hence it survives in his account. From the Coan story it has almost disappeared, but leaves a trace in the way in which the surrounding sections are bound together. This is assuredly not what we would expect if the folktale was a learned and comparatively modern rehandling of Ovid. Here our loss is strongly in the folktale's favour.

The Curse

When the oak falls Ovid and the Coan congener introduce a similar judgment. In the latter it is delivered by Dimitroula, dying in the oak: 'Even as God punished your wicked father, even so and three times worse will He punish you' (p. 337). Dimitroula who falls down the hollow oak and bleeds when the axe strikes her is

---

[1] Now that this feature occurs in both Ovid and the Coan tale it may be time to ask whether it can be explained historically. At *Zeus* II pp. 681 f. Cook examines on the one hand coinage of Myra in Lycia (featuring a tree with a female image in the branches, attacked by two men with double axes and defended by two snakes: fig. 620) and of Aphrodisias in Karia (a leafless tree is attacked by two naked men, one of whom brandishes a double axe while the other kneels or runs away). He draws upon the abundant examples in Frazer, *Golden Bough*[3]: *The Magic Art* ii. 20-22, for a rite of threatening a sacred tree to make it fruitful; generally one person threatens while another successfully intercedes for the tree. I wonder whether the Pious Servant has grown from a distortion of such a rite, perhaps through the misunderstanding of an ancient representation. I am only too ready to admit that this idea has been made ridiculous through the *Greek Myths* of Robert Graves, but so sober a scholar as Prof. Rose was prepared to believe that once in a while things happened that way. It is also no comfort that the example which inspired his suggestion, Hyg. *fab.* 28. 4 (see his edition *ad loc.*), has now been attractively explained in another way by Schwartz, *Pseudo-Hesiodeia*, pp. 308-10. We still remain at a general disadvantage in not having a clear idea of what the Greeks in a particular place in a particular period customarily saw. For example, Kallimachos' scene at H. 6. 69 ff., 94 ff., would mean a little more if it owed anything to the *Totenmahlrelief* (see Rouse, *Gk. Votive Offerings*, pp. 18 ff.; Deneken, Roscher *s.v.* Heros, 2554 f.; especially J. Harrison, *Themis*, pp. 308 and 310, fig. 87, 89).

clearly a rationalization of the ancient picture of oak-hamadryad-bleeding. Just as Erysichthon has probably become the ploughman, so Demeter has certainly become what was once the nymph. In Ovid it is of course the nymph who curses Erysichthon (771 ff.):

> 'Nympha sub hoc ego sum Cereri gratissima ligno:
> quae tibi factorum poenas instare tuorum
> uaticinor moriens, nostri solacia leti'.

Erysichthon as Beggar

It is also important that, after the sequence in which shepherds, butchers, poulterers, fishermen, etc. work overtime to supply the demands of the king's son, we find the words:

> 'But his insatiability had no bounds, and so in a few years he had consumed all his possessions and *was left in poverty, always hungry*' (ἠπόμεινε φτωχὸς πεινασμένος πάντα, p. 340).

The Mestra story, or what is left of it, follows this sentence. Here clearly we still see the stage at which Kallimachos has concluded his narrative with the static picture of Erysichthon, a beggar at the crossroads. It is a clear break in the story, but not a real conclusion, for it lacks a dénouement. It is not true to say, as Dawkins (p. 347) does, that in Kallimachos' version 'at last he *died* a penniless beggar' (my italics). For his own purposes the poet says no more than what we may presume his source to have said on this occasion.

Mestra

Inevitably most interest centres around the reference to Mestra, and in a few sentences the Coan tale adds to our knowledge considerably (p. 340):

> 'He had nothing more to sell to buy food to eat, nothing but one daughter and one son. His son he at last thought fit to sell, and so he managed for yet some days. Then he tried to sell his daughter, but he could find no one to buy her. Then in his furious hunger he flings himself on his daughter to devour her. But by her good fortune her brother happened to be there: he snatched her away from him and they ran off, and so the poor girl escaped. Then he began to tear at his own flesh and to eat it, insomuch that he died, his very nails actually in his mouth'.

Zielinski would have rejoiced to see the reference to Mestra's brother. At I. 149 ff. he devotes a good deal of space to the examination of various types of *märchen* involving the sale of a relative with powers of metamorphosis. It is particularly common in the

'Master and Pupil' motif [1], which has two characteristic features: the changing of human beings into animals to defraud purchasers and a transformation fight. The latter involves a duel between two people with the gift of metamorphosis, generally the sorcerer and his apprentice. At I. 151 Zielinski outlines a Russian version in which a son acquires the gift of metamorphosis. He changes into a horse which his mother sells, but she keeps the bridle and with it the young man's soul, so that he comes back to her. The third time Och, the spirit responsible for the gift, buys him and naturally will not allow the mother to keep the bridle. The young man flees, pursued by Och. Finally he gets the better of the spirit in a Transformation Fight, marries the king's daughter, and enjoys the customary subsequent happiness. 'Hier ist es also die Mutter, die den Sohn verkauft; in anderen Versionen verkauft der Vater den Sohn; im Mestra-märchen der Vater die Tochter' (152).

The idea that the Mestra story was evidence for the existence of the 'Master and Pupil' theme in Greece seems first to have been suggested by Karl Schenckl in 1865 [2]. His and Zielinski's ideas were attacked by E. Cosquin [3], Halliday [4] and Dawkins [5]. There are two main grounds, firstly [6] that this type of story would not lose its identity if the sale sequence were omitted, secondly that the sale sequence is not confined to this particular story [7]. Perhaps I should make it clear at the start that the brother in the Coan version can only be a late intrusion, to provide an artificial *ex machina* solution to the problem created by the omission of Mestra's powers of metamorphosis and any role which Autolykos [8] may have in the dénouement of the literary version. In wringing the magic out of the Mestra story, the teller responsible has merely continued the work of the allegorical school. We see something similar in the

---

[1] See especially the discussion by Halliday in Dawkins' *Modern Greek in Asia Minor* (C. U. P. 1916), pp. 265 ff. He provides a good example from Ulaghatsh in Cappodocia at pp. 365 ff.

[2] *Germania* 10, p. 342.

[3] *Études folkloriques* (Paris 1922), pp. 497-612: 'Les Mongols et leur prétendu rôle dans la transmission des contes indiens vers l'occident européen' (earlier in *Rev. des Traditions Populaires* 1912). See pp. 502 ff. for the *Master and Pupil* theme, pp. 511 ff., 570 ff. for the Transformation Fight, pp. 601-05 for the Mestra story.

[4] *Loc. cit.*

[5] *Forty Five Stories*, p. 349.

[6] Cosquin, *op. cit.*, p. 604.

[7] Halliday, *op. cit.*, p. 266.

[8] To be discussed below.

treatment of Iasion. When his legend is stripped of its connexions with both primitive magic and the belief that divinities were capable of taking a lively interest in particular mortals, Iasion became merely a ploughman favoured by Nature [1]. The same process has probably turned Erysichthon into merely 'a very handsome youth, hard-working and the richest man in the land', and has divested Mestra of her gift; hence it is a brother who is successfully sold, with presumably a higher work potential.

Notwithstanding this late appearance of the brother, it is worth bearing in mind for future consideration the possibility that a more essential characteristic of the 'Master and Pupil' story was once included in that of Mestra. Cosquin [2] attacked Schenckl on the following grounds:

> 'En définitive, — et M. Zielinski le reconnaît lui-même (p. 153) — dans le *Magicien et son apprenti*, le héros est vendu *sous forme d'animal* et revient à la maison sous sa forme naturelle; dans le récit d'Ovide, Mestra est vendue *sous sa forme naturelle* et s'échappe sous forme d'animal'.

Schenckl had made the mistake of calling this 'ein ganz aehnlicher Zug' in the two stories. But at the same time surely the difference is significant. For Ovid's limited use of the Mestra story it did not make an atom of difference whether she was sold in animal form or not. That he mentions the unexpected return in animal form can only be explained on the assumption that he found it in a source, in which it had a special function. But if we are dealing with a story with a long history, this unusual feature might prove to be a refinement upon the expected pattern. The moment we look back beyond the Ovidian story, signs of development present themselves.

But Mestra sold in animal form would prove nothing. It would be otherwise if we could establish a Transformation Fight. In the last analysis this would depend on the role of Autolykos in this story.

Autolykos

The Mestra story, for all its truncated state, makes, I suspect, some concession to the form of the earlier story when it shows the

---

[1] Herakleitos, *Quaest. Hom.* 68. 2, p. 89 Teubner edtn.: Ἰασίων, ἀνὴρ γεωργίας ἐπιμελούμενος καὶ δαψιλεῖς τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων ἀγρῶν καρποὺς λαμβάνων, εἰκότως ὑπὸ τῆς Δήμητρος ἔδοξεν ἠγαπῆσθαι. Cf. Buffière, *Les Mythes d'Homère*, p. 240.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 603.

moment of Erysichthon's abandonment, in this case by Mestra and her brother. We know that a point is reached at which Mestra, although sold again and again, cannot satisfy her father's hunger. Ovid (*Met.* 8. 875-6; cf. 838-9), according to the general interpretation—which we shall discuss later—, gives the impression that the affliction kept growing:

> 'uis tamen illa mali postquam consumpserat omnem
> materiam, dederatque graui *noua pabula* morbo . . .'

If this does suggest that Mestra found her task beyond her powers, it would merely be a subterfuge on Ovid's part to conceal the fact that he is foreshortening the tale, by ignoring the manner in which Erysichthon's shape-changing daughter lost her usefulness; for the disproportionate treatment of Mestra suggests that she is Ovid's passport to cover the foreign territory of the Erysichthon story.

But why should Erysichthon be deserted? There are four types of answer possible, I think. Firstly, that Erysichthon's business malpractices became notorious, and the time came when his daughter could not be sold. The advantage of this answer would be that it could obviously be made to dovetail with the points preserved in the Coan congener. Secondly, since οὐκ ἀποφώλιοι εὐναὶ ἀθανάτων [1] pregnancy might be expected to impair the efficiency of the most versatile of shape-changers. It is no serious objection to this that the *Catalogue* presents Mestra as already a mother when she cared for Erysichthon, for there is no chance that Ovid draws directly on pseudo-Hesiod. His mention of Autolykos points in the other direction. Thirdly, Erysichthon's habits may have become so anti-social that Mestra was forced to flee. This is the reason presented in the Coan story; we shall consider it shortly, but it can as easily follow desertion as precede it. Fourthly, perhaps most commonly assumed, the connexion of Mestra with Autolykos provides the clue. The reader will appreciate that Hesiod does not tell us the end of the Erysichthon story, Ovid foreshortens it, the Coan tale has transformed the magic of Mestra while Kallimachos does not relate the Mestra episode at all. The following defence of the function of Autolykos can therefore provide no more than a suggestion.

---

[1] Hes. fr. C 2-3 (Merkelbach, *Die Hesiodfragmente auf Papyrus*, p. 6); *Od.* 11. 249-50. Cf. Page, *Homeric Odyssey*, pp. 37-8. It is interesting that on both occasions Poseidon was the speaker.

The only surviving statement that Mestra became Autolykos' wife is found at *Met.* 8. 738: 'Nec minus Autolyci coniunx Erysichthone nata/iuris habet'. Schwartz has what seems to me a curious point to make on this association:

> 'Il y a une contradiction évidente dans le récit d'Ovide: Erysichthon ne peut plus vendre sa fille si elle est l'épouse d'Autolycos. Même si l'on soutient que le v. 738 ne dit pas depuis quand Mestra est l'épouse d'Autolycos, sa défloration par Neptune suppose une progéniture (cf. λ 249-250) qu'adoptera par la suite, selon un schéma classique, le futur époux de la belle.' (p. 601).

Prof. Schwartz goes on to say that, if Ovid had drawn directly on pseudo-Hesiod, he would not have brought Autolykos into the picture at all. I agree that we must look for a Hellenistic intermediary rather than for the use of pseudo-Hesiod, but for the reason that the Coan congener and 'Nicander' certainly, and Achaios possibly, point to the existence of material on which the poet could draw without direct knowledge of the *Catalogue*. At the same time it is true that it is difficult to conceive how Mestra could marry Autolykos within the pseudo-Hesiodic framework; it would presumably have to follow Sisyphos' unsuccessful mediation on Glaukos' behalf, and therefore require treatment at a different place, say, a section devoted to Autolykos. This cannot be dismissed as impossible, but it would certainly destroy any possibility that there was a relationship between Autolykos and the frustration of Erysichthon's schemes; I should prefer to think that there was.

The first thing to be borne in mind is that Ovid makes no *direct* use of Autolykos at all. The situation would therefore be rather striking, to say the least, if Ovid could not foresee an objection which is claimed to be obvious to us. To mention an Autolykos who was married to Mestra before her aid to her father would seem to me sheer lunacy on somebody's part and not to be entertained for a moment. The invocation of a 'schéma classique' for the adoption of Poseidon's child by Mestra's future husband would carry weight only if there were a time limit prescribed. I cannot see that in itself this argument tells against a connexion with the *Catalogue*, and it would certainly not trouble a later writer.

The second point of importance is that Ovid does not name Mestra at all. For the reason for this curious omission Zielinski deserves to be right [1]. He compared Ovid, *Heroides* XI, where

---

[1] 2. 17 n. 3. I think that this explanation deserves to be more widely known.

Canace is the subject but she is only named as *Aeolis*. His suggestion was that her name was uncomfortably close in sound to *canis*; hence it was no surprise that at *Met.* 3. 217 one of Actaion's dogs bore the name of Canace. Similarly Mestra suggested *me/n/strua, n* being particularly unstable in Latin before *st*; the name was therefore untouchable. Whatever the reason, she is not mentioned, and this state of affairs surely requires that 'wife of Autolykos' and 'daughter of Erysichthon' are there to help identify the subject. If it is reasonable to suggest that Ovid would not have introduced Autolykos in a role which made nonsense of his story, there is still more reason for belief that he would not have introduced him in a role which he never had at all. Ovid's readers must be no strangers to Mestra's marriage to Autolykos.

The logical time for such a marriage would be either at the end of the sale sequence or after Erysichthon's death. The former assumption seems to me far more rewarding, for then a Callimachean pattern from a significant place would find an echo. At H. 6. 24 the poet introduces an aetiological reference: οὔπω τὰν Κνιδίαν, ἔτι Δώτιον ἱρὸν ἔναιον, pointing to the final establishment of the Triopion by the House of Triopas. This is a gratuitous offering, but he knows that he intends to omit the section at the end which would provide the logical place for mentioning the fact. He does not intend to follow the fortunes of the House further than the beggary of Erysichthon. Similarly in Ovid it is worth seeing in the mention of Autolykos something which should logically be at the end, had Ovid chosen to take the story to a normal end: Autolykos was responsible for the close of Mestra's career as shape-changer.

If there are one or more lost Hellenistic models, the selling episode would provide an excellent opportunity for bringing two tricksters such as Mestra and Autolykos together. It is a safe bet they were associated in any case because they were 'birds of a feather'; it would not surprise if this was worked into the narrative. In Zielinski's reconstruction (1. 152) Autolykos was the last of the buyers of Mestra, and 'er, der listenreiche, musste leicht auf den Grund des Zaubers kommen, der die Jungfrau immer wieder dem Vater zurückführte'. Where all is surmise, logic will not carry us far, but there seems to me an argument against this idea. As we have said, in Ovid's version Mestra returns home in animal form. Since there is no earthly reason why he should have invented this point,

we expect it to be functional in an earlier version. A return home in animal form does not allow the opportunity for well chosen words that the change of sex provided, and perhaps this is significant. Was Mestra intercepted in animal form by Autolykos, prince among cattle-lifters?

Our records for Mestra are so inadequate that no apology is necessary for the suggestion that, if there was no Transformation Fight in the Mestra story, through the implication of Autolykos there may well have been something very similar. The trickster is remembered for his legerdemain (Hes. fr. 112) and his ability to change the brands on cattle [1]. We do not know the date by which his powers were first widened. Schol. *Od.* 19. 432 declares that Autolykos εἶχε ταύτην τὴν τέχνην παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ὥστε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὅτε κλέπτοι τι λανθάνειν καὶ τὰ θρέμματα τῆς λείας ἀλλοιοῦν εἰς ὃ θέλοι μορφῆς. Hyginus (*fab.* 201) has something similar: 'Mercurius Autolyco . . . muneri dedit ut furacissimus esset nec deprehenderetur in furto; ut quicquid surripuisset in quamcumque effigiem uellet transmutaretur'. In a form which it is impossible now to calculate precisely the ingredients are here for an entertaining clash between the couple.

The Abandonment

The reminder of the Coan folktale that a moment inevitably comes in the story when Erysichthon is derelict, a situation which is as evident in Kallimachos' truncated version (where Erysichthon sits at the crossroads), invites another glance at *Ibis* 425-6, where Ovid again alludes to the story:

> 'Utque pater solitae uarias mutare figuras
> plenus inextincta *destituare* fame'.

The precise extent of this reading is far from clear from a comparison of the editions of La Penna (destituare TFV *Conr.* destituere AZxy) and Lenz (destituare $FP_4R_1TVV_4$ *Conr.*). Neither mentions H in this regard, although Housman [2] credits it with *destituare.* Whatever its authority, it is certainly true to say that no editor since Merkel has held it in high regard; the *v. l. conficiare* is commonly placed in the text. It is argued that *destituare* came into existence as a result of the sequence: 'desertus (415) . . . destituat (420) . . . liquescat (423), lapsa . . . effluat' (424). Both Lenz and La Penna

[1] See Schwartz, *Pseudo-Hesiodeia,* pp. 441-6.
[2] *Journ. of Philol.* 35 (1919/20), 291.

seem to find an additional argument in the suggestion that *CLE* 1058, 10 [1] is a reminiscence of 426: 'huic sit iniqua Ceres perficiatque fame'. Schrader had even gone so far as to suggest *conficiatque*, on the basis of the Ovidian line. The similarity, however, is hardly striking.

The choice of verb also affects the function of *plenus*. If *conficiare* is favoured, *plenus* will signify 'although full', and give unobjectionable sense and a characteristic Ovidian paradox. It would be possible to feel that Erysichthon's fullness is not appropriate to the moment of his demise, but at the same time one could not reasonably expect great detail from a mere couplet. But the association of *plenus* and *fame* also gives special point. It finds a parallel in Lucilius [2]: *rugosum atque fami* [3] *plenum*. The paradox that Erysichthon should be full, not of food, but of hunger is equally effective and also thoroughly Callimachean. In the final analysis, however, it will be the strength of the argument in favour of one of the two verbs that must decide.

It seems to me, as it seemed to Zielinski [4], that *destituare* is genuine, and that it alludes to a particular episode in the story. Erysichthon must face abandonment, and it is at this moment that he takes the gruesome final step. From this standpoint it is also possible to explain why two alternate readings so dissimilar as *destituare* and *conficiare* exist. At some time in the course of the transmission a scribe nodded. He construed *destituare fame* as 'may you be robbed of hunger' [5], rightly boggled at the sense and substituted an obvious [6] word to give a more likely meaning.

Erysichthon the Cannibal

While the attack on Mestra herself may be no part of the ancient story, the orientation has some supporting evidence. This had to be rejected by Crusius [7] as 'ohne Belang . . . denn ein Analogon . . . wird man in der Sage nicht voraussetzen dürfen', but the idea that Erysichthon would naturally turn on his daughter lends it

[1] = Bücheler, *Anth. Lat.* II, 2 p. 486.
[2] Fr. 460 Warmington (Loeb).
[3] Here the genitive is used with *plenus*.
[4] 1. 137 n. 2, 152 n. 42.
[5] For the abl. with *destituo* cf. Ov. *Epist.* 3. 143; Thesaurus *s.v.* coll. 763, 765.
[6] Cf. Cic. *Off.* 3. 6. 29; *Verr.* 5. 134; *Fam.* 7. 26. 1; Sall. Hist. III. 1. 2.
[7] Roscher I, i. 1377. 49 ff.

some support. I refer to the theme of cannibalism [1] which appears in Agathias *Anth. Pal.* xi. 379.

οὔ τις ἀλοιητῆρας ἰδεῖν τέτληκεν ὀδόντας
ὑμετέρους, ἵνα σοῖς ἐν μεγάροις πελάσῃ·
εἰ γὰρ ἀεὶ βούβρωστιν ἔχεις Ἐρυσίχθονος αὐτοῦ,
ναὶ τάχα δαρδάψεις καὶ φίλον ὃν καλέεις.
ἀλλ' οὐ σεῖο μέλαθρά με δέξεται· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε
βήσομαι ὑμετέρῃ γαστρὶ φυλαξόμενος.
εἰ δέ ποτ' ἐς τεὸν οἶκον ἐλεύσομαι, οὐ μέγ' ἄνυσσεν
Λαρτιάδης Σκύλλης χάσμασιν ἀντιάσας·
ἀλλ' ἔσομαι πολύτλας τις ἐγὼ πλέον, εἰ σε περήσω,
Κύκλωπος κρυεροῦ μηδὲν ἐλαφρότερον.

Now it would be strange if Erysichthon were described as resorting to self-destruction before *all* else had failed, and there is another piece of evidence that this phase of the story existed in greater detail than hitherto generally credited, the epitome of the Ovidian story furnished by 'Lactantius Placidus' [2]. This closes on the note: 'Cuius exitus fuit talis, ut ‹post› [3] uarios in fame cibos nouissime uisceribus suis epulari cogeretur'. Here it is clear that the epitomizer knew another episode quite distinct from Erysichthon's craving for food *before* Mestra is sold, for this has already been treated ('... omnibus rebus ab eo consumptis ...'). In this respect his account is parallel to the Coan tale: 'In a few years he had consumed all his possessions ... He had nothing more to sell to buy food ... His son he at last thought fit to sell, and so he managed for yet some days ... he flings himself on his daughter to devour her'.

B. Otis [4] has pertinently discussed the frequency with which 'Lactantius' supplements, and even contradicts, Ovid from other sources. We may note the incident under discussion as a further illustration of the ancient material embedded in the epitomes.

[1] This element was apparently so natural to Dawkins that he unconsciously assumed that it was already in Ovid's account of Mestra: Poseidon 'enabled her in the form of a fisherman to escape being devoured by her father' (p. 347). For Erysichthon-Aithon as γαστρίμαργος, see Schol. Laur. Aeschin. III. 183. For γαστρίμαργος as 'cannibal', cf. Pind. *O.* 1. 52 and Xanthos *Lydiaka* 765 F 18 Jacoby (Xanthos distinguishes it from πολυφάγος).

[2] *Narr. Fab.* Lib. VII Fab. XI.

[3] Restored by Micyllus and rightly approved as the simplest solution by Colon and D. A. Slater (*Towards a Text of the Metamorphoses of Ovid,* 1927).

[4] *Harvard Stud. Class. Philol.* 47 (1936), 131-163.

Now it may be taken for granted that Erysichthon's diet at this stage in the proceedings will be more unattractive than hitherto, and it would not be surprising if it followed the pattern of progressive degeneration that so often emerges in the ancient descriptions of protracted sieges, culminating in cannibalism. For this reason perhaps we should read 'post uarios *infames* cibos' in 'Lactantius', comparing Sidonius [1] on the siege of Narbonne ('trepidantia cingens miles in *infames* iam iamque coegerat *escas*') and Orosius [2] on the siege of Calagurris ('obsidione confectam atque ad *infames escas* miseranda inopia coactam').

It is worth remembering that Kallimachos' tale is unique in providing any details of Erysichthon's degradation: the eating of the mules, the heifer destined for Hestia, the racehorse, the war-charger, the 'white-tail', 'at which tiny creatures trembled'. Quite often traditional siege stories *start* with these same 'tiny creatures', telling us of the high price which rats and mice fetched during the last days. Kallimachos, we shall see, is transforming what might have been a pathetic tale into comedy, but we may at the same time suspect that in an earlier literary source he found a far more grisly and emotional sequence to be the basis for his transformation.

I suspect, therefore, that in Ovid's *Ibis* (425-6) we have a perfect junction between the tales of *desertion* which precede and those of *cannibalism* which follow [3]. And perhaps *Met.* 8. 875-6 is worth another look. I wonder whether 'Lactantius' is really supplementing Ovid, as I said, or whether—correctly or incorrectly—he is interpreting him. The vulgate text reads: 'uis tamen illa mali postquam consumpserat omnem/materiam, dederatque graui noua pabula morbo . .'. This has led to discussion, for *uis illa mali* seems to mean *illud uiolentum malum* and the whole thought oddly to suggest that *morbus ille grauis augebat morbum,* as G. E. Gierig-J. C. Jahn [3] argued *ad loc.* In consequence some have adopted Burman's conjecture *deerantque,* but quite unnecessarily. It has been pointed out that the vulgate provides a characteristic parodox: the impetus, violence, force of the affliction gave new fuel to the oppressive disease; or, to use A. E. Watts' translation, 'When all was gone that could his pangs appease,/ And nought was nourished save the

---

1 *Carm.* VII. 476-7.

2 *Hist.* 5, 23, 14. Cf. *Hist.* 1, 19, 7 (*infames epulae,* of cannibalism).

3 Tydeus' eating of human flesh; a foul deed such as to make the sun reverse its course (e.g. Atreus'); the sons of Lykaon; Pelops.

dread disease'. This gives adequate sense and point, but there is another possibility which 'Lactantius' may have seen.

When this stage in his decline has been reached Erysichthon turns to autophagy, the final, desperate measure. Any less fatal expedients must already have been tried—the eating of grass, leaves, and so on [1], also cannibalism. When Conradus *ad* Ov. *Ib.* 425 [2] remarks: '*omnibus mobilibus et immobilibus distractis et devoratis*, filiam suam multotiens vendidit', the unlikelihood that he is drawing on more than a fertile imagination (also suggested by the fact that he has Mestra change shape 'nutu deorum'), coupled with the presence of this detail before the sale of Mestra, may seem to discredit completely the words of 'Lactantius'. That is, it may seem that we are only dealing with late extravagances. But it should at least be borne in mind that, the more natural the idea seems that Erysichthon would have left no stone unturned, the more we must face the possibility that the ancients themselves of the pre-Christian era had had no different approach.

In the Ovidian text *noua pabula* may reasonably suggest 'strange, untoward food', covering all the wretched provender with which the starving may seek to sustain life, and *pabula* itself may convey overtones of brutishness. At Val. Fl. 4. 106 [3] *pabula dira* refers to Polyphemus' diet of human flesh. Moreover there is in Juvenal (15. 99 ff.) a passage which beyond doubt is based on Ovid: 'post omnis herbas, post cuncta animalia, quicquid/ cogebat uacui uentris furor, hostibus ipsis/ pallorem ac maciem et tenuis miserantibus artus,/ membra aliena fame lacerabant, esse parati/ et sua'. The closing phrase is a direct echo of Erysichthon's autophagy, while *uacui uentris furor* gives essentially the same message as *uis illa mali.* It is possible, therefore, that, when we find paradox in these lines of Ovid, for once we are reading too much into them; the violence of the affliction gave, provided (i.e. forced Erysichthon to find) strange fodder for the disease. [4]

---

[1] The 1653/4 Amsterdam edition of Ovid (*v.* M. D. Henkel, *Vorträge d. Bibl. Warburg*, 1926-7, p. 107) is not as unreasonable as we may be inclined to think, when it shows among its wood-cuts Erysichthon as Nebuchadnezzar (Daniel 4^{25}), crawling on all fours and eating grass.

[2] A. La Penna, *Schol. in P. Ovidi Nas. Ibin* (1959), pp. 110 f.

[3] Cf. Stat. *Theb.* 12. 566.

[4] If this is really what Ovid meant, I should prefer to think that he wrote *grauis*, rather than *graui*. *Morbo grauis* occurs at Verg. *G.* 3. 95 and Sen. *Oed.* 1052. Latin can be very economical with its syntax in poetry (see K. F. Quinn, *Aumla* 14 (1960), 36-46), and here *morbo* may serve a double

Before we leave the theme of cannibalism, it is worth recalling the incident recorded at Paus. 8. 42. 4. When the old wooden image of Black Demeter near Phigalia in Arcadia had been destroyed by fire, the Phigalians not only did not replace it but further discontinued most of her festivals. The resultant famine drove them to consult Delphi, where the Pythia told them that it was the work of Demeter, καί σ' ἀλληλοφάγον θήσει τάχα καὶ τεκνοδαίτην [1]. Whether the oracle is factual or belonging to 'quelque littérature édifiante d'origine sacerdotale' [2], it illustrates a belief that it was from ἀλληλοφαγία that Demeter saved the Greeks and to ἀλληλοφαγία, when her wrath was aroused, that they would return.

Erysichthon's Punishment

The great and unthought-of evil with which the king's son is afflicted, Ravening Hunger, has called for special stage effects in the Coan story. We find first a curious dream sequence in which a fairy transports him to the scene of the crime, scorches him with a forest fire and sets him a-shiver with freezing cold, proclaiming the while: 'This and very much worse is the lot of those who cut my beautiful trees' (p. 339). Since Erysichthon's hunger and thirst are still to be experienced in dream and fact, this preliminary skirmish may seem artistically *de trop*, but it is clearly introduced for secondary dramatic purposes; thereby Hunger is allowed to make use of Erysichthon's sword, still wedged in the oak. Notwithstanding, it is interesting to see a parallel with Ovid not only in the dream (Met. 8. 817 ff.), but also in the references to heat and cold. These are physiological truths which are represented in Ovid by his echo of αἴθων λιμός at 846 *flamma gulae* and by the statement at 790 that Frigus, Pallor and Tremor are domiciled with Hunger.

---

function: as indirect object and also to define *grauis*. (For those who are prepared to interpret Verg. *Ecl.* 1. 49 'non insueta *graues* temptabunt pabula fetas' as 'sickly', the question would be much simpler). The pattern of such a line as 874 ('praebebatque avido non iusta alimenta parenti') would then have been responsible for scribal emendation to *graui*. But of course the fury of the affliction may be described as 'providing' fouler foods, no less than a 'sick man' himself.

[1] Parke-Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle* I, pp. 323-4; Wilamowitz, *Glaube der Hellenen* I, pp. 402 ff. Cf. Porph. *De Abstin.* I 23-4, II 56-7; Mnaseas *ap.* Schol. Pind. *P.* 4. 106 a: ἄνευ γὰρ Νυμφῶν οὔτε Δημήτερος ἱερὸν τιμᾶται διὰ τὸ ταύτας πρώτας καρπὸν ἀποδεῖξαι καὶ τὴν ἀλληλοφαγίαν παῦσαι. With Demeter's suppression of cannibalism by the promotion of agriculture compare the similar tale told of Osiris (Diod. Sic. I. 14. 1).

[2] Marie Delcourt, *L'Oracle de Delphes*, p. 115.

In both Ovid and Kallimachos Erysichthon and his followers are armed with axes (πελέκεις, *bipennes*), and Kallimachos supplies the information that, when the servants flee, they leave them sticking in the trees. There is no mention in the latter author of the idea that 'the king in his terror leaves his weapon sticking in the outraged tree' (p. 348); perhaps here Dawkins is unconsciously levelling the versions. But in the Coan tale, while the followers take their axes away, Erysichthon leaves his *sword* in the oak, after he has tried in vain to strike Dimitroula and cannot withdraw the weapon from the tree. I cannot follow A. B. Cook in his conclusions on the legend, but the examples of similar stories featuring axes, swords and knives stuck in trees, which he cites in *Zeus* II i, pp. 677-85 [1], testify to the antiquity of this theme. At Kos, however, the sword was prompted by an idea for an innovation in Hunger's *modus operandi*.

The hag, although described with anatomical detail which recalls Ovid, is strongly reminiscent of Kallimachos' Demeter [2] when she pulls out from the oak the sword which Erysichthon could not release, 'raises herself to her full height and becomes three times as tall and three as big'. She then breathes on the sword, 'filling every part of it with seeds like the knots in measly pork', raises it above him and booms: 'I am Ravening Hunger'. This should have been no news to the king's son, but his reaction conveniently

[1] This is an important collection of material, covering the *bipennis* of Hellos of Dodona, the sword of Kinyras, the *bipennis* of Erysichthon and the knife of Phylakos (on this last now see Van der Valk, *R.E.G.* 71 (1958), 102 f.). He introduces comparative material from Albania (p. 678), and from the Volsung saga and an Irish folktale (pp. 682 f.).

[2] Dawkins (p. 348) does not discuss this interesting case among his parallels. In Ovid Hunger is a puff of thistledown, light enough to float through the air (*Met.* 8. 815-6); in Kallimachos it is a dynamic, militant Demeter who personally exacts vengeance in the epic manner, ἔμβαλε, after her intermediary—herself as Nikippe, and with no sinister intent—has been rebuffed. On Kos Hunger, showing elements of both versions, is at once fragile and superhuman. As she approaches she moves very slowly (p. 339), but finally acts like an Olympian. Since Demeter has been turned into a mortal Dimitroula, any role that the goddess may have had to play is amalgamated with that of Hunger.

Incidently, I do not think that Dawkins can be right in pointing a parallel between Ovid and the modern story in that 'in both of them there is a virtuous man who opposes the wicked king and so loses his life'—the murdered woodman in Ovid, the young ploughman on Kos. There are, as we have seen, traces of the episode of the decapitated martyr in the Coan version, and if the young ploughman really was his substitute, a large part of the story would have been rewritten to harmonize with a rather trivial incident.

does not begin until this point. He opens his mouth a full span to cry out, and Hunger slips the sword down into his belly, whereby the seeds of hunger are transferred to his entrails.

A nice additional touch is that while the bloody sword is being withdrawn he licks it and adds thirst to his suffering. The ancients associated insatiable thirst with *boulimia* [1]. Kallimachos (H. 6. 69-71) found his own way of accounting for this: Dionysos, so often Demeter's *paredros* [2] in cult, was also offended. Perhaps it was the flippancy of this mock-serious, mythological treatment which led Ovid to give all mention of drink a wide berth.

Now it will be obvious that Hunger's use of the sword is an innovation, for the operation would have been exceedingly difficult with the original *bipennis!* But Ovid, who drew so much on folktale [3], agrees to some extent in the way that the disease is spread,

[1] See Cahen, *Comm.*, p. 268.

[2] E.g. Pind. *Isthm.* 7. 3-5; Schol. Ar. *Ran.* 326. Cf. Cahen, *Comm.*, p. 269. I think that this is an inevitable conclusion, even though Wilamowitz' συνῳκίσθη for συνωργίσθη of the MSS. at H. 6. 71 must be rejected.

[3] At Z 1. 153 ff. a Russian version of the Medeia story, with the feature of metamorphosis added, is discussed. It concerns Wasilissa the Wise, daughter of the Sea King, who flees with her husband from her home. 'The king observes their flight and sends men out to pursue them. When the pursuers draw near, Wasilissa changes herself into a jug and the king's son into an old man and the horses into a spring. The pursuers make enquiries of the old man whether the fleeing party had ridden past. 'Oh yes', he replied, 'but that was a long time ago. *It happened when I was still a young man*.' It was not lost on Zielinski that the disguised lover's remark is of the same order as disguised Mestra's at *Met.* 8. 866 ff. ('sic has deus aequoris artes/ adiuuet, ut nemo iamdudum litore in isto,/ me tamen excepto, nec femina constitit ulla'). It is interesting to notice that both overdo things: 'that was a long time ago' and 'me tamen excepto', from an artistic point of view, would be better omitted or changed. But the folktale is pitched for an audience of no great subtlety, and I imagine that in H. 6. 70 and 71—where the poet seems to harp unnecessarily on a viewpoint—Kallimachos is humorously playing the same game.

The same viewpoint may explain the double lines drawn by Ovid at 864-8. Here two ideas are juxtaposed: 'Quisquis es, ignoscas! in nullam lumina partem/ gurgite ab hoc flexi studioque operatus inhaesi' (864-5) and 'sic has deus . . . ulla' (already cited), bound together by 'quoque minus dubites'. Zielinski (1. 139 n. 7) found 'an obvious dittography'. 'Quisquis . . . inhaesi' was the poet's first thought, but later he wrote a more ingenious 'Quisquis es, ignoscas, sic . . . ulla'. Both were found in copies of the work and bound by the awkward *quoque minus dubites* (cf. *Met.* 2. 44, 8. 620). Ehwald, Bursian 80 (1894), 38, was not convinced, but at 2. 4 n. 1 Zielinski still regarded his argument as irrefutable. I think it is true to say with Zielinski that there is an incongruity in the text, for if the fisherman keeps his eye so intently on his work, then he ought not to be able to carry conviction with a subsequent assurance that 'he' alone has been there. But the

by breath and seed. On the one hand we have 'seque uiro *inspirat* faucesque et pectus et ora/ *adflat*' (819-20), on the other 'ea se in praecordia *condat*' (791) and 'et in uacuis *spargit* (*v. l.* peragit) ieiunia uenis' (820). On Kos, as often in the modern Greek folktale involving personified diseases [1], Hunger *breathes* on the sword, filling it with *seeds* of hunger. The *modus operandi* of Envy in *Met.* 2 is necessarily similar to that of *Met.* 8: 'tangit ... implet ... inspirat ... dissipat ... spargit' (799-802; cf. 793-4). That there are close connexions between the delineation of Envy and Hunger in Ovid has often been remarked [2]. While it is of a little interest that Envy appears in the episode of Aglauros and Herse, sisters of Erysichthon of Prasiai, a namesake of the victim of Hunger in the later book, it is probably the techniques of the folktale which explain the similarities.

Conclusions from the Coan Tale

The realignment in our thinking that is required by the existence of this new version is now, I hope, clear. Dawkins alludes to it briefly on p. 349: 'Wilamowitz thought that Ovid had no other source than Callimachus: would he have held this view if he could have read the story collected in Kos by Zarraftis?' Actually Wilamowitz' position is rather more complicated than this short note would suggest:

---

incongruity may simply reflect the naiveté of a folktale when coping with two levels of reference, and what is really ideal material for a satyr-play (cf. Büchner, *Humanitas Romana*, pp. 213, 218), may eschew for comic effect a thorough application of logical processes.

For the Oath with Reservation in folklore, see E. Rohde, *Der gr. Roman und seine Vorläufer*, p. 515 n. 1. Of course Mestra's remark shows a characteristic Ovidian use of paradox, similar to that at *Met.* 11. 618 ff., where Sleep can hardly rouse himself but at length 'shook himself off' (*excussit sibi se*), or at 2. 430, where disguised Zeus *sibi praeferri se gaudet*. Cf. Rohde, *op. cit.*, p. 15 n. 7; E. Doblhofer, *Philol.* 104 (1960), 89. But we must not imagine that what is characteristically Ovidian is necessarily invented by Ovid. This is the whole message of the Coan tale for us, and, for the point under discussion, it would be unkind to rob Claudian (*In Rufin.* I 32) of the attractive thought 'impatiensque sui Morbus' by assuming Ovidian influence. Ovid is utilizing a feature of folktale which he found very much to his liking.

[1] See K. Chrysanthis, 'The Personification of Plague and Cholera according to the Cypriots', *Folklore* 56 (1945), 259-66.

[2] 2. 775 *pallor in ore sedet*: 8. 801 *pallor in ore*; 2. 776 *liuent rubigine dentes*: 8. 802: *scabrae rubigine fauces*.

> 'Zuletzt wollen wir Ovid betrachten, von dem sich die Modernen allzusehr haben verführen lassen, weil sie seine eigene Erfindsamkeit unterschätzten. Für die Erysichthongeschichte hat er sich allein an Kallimachos gehalten; wo er die Mestra her hat, wissen wir nicht; sie verwandelt sich auch in Tiere wie bei Hesiodos, aber das erste Mal wechselt sie nur das Geschlecht wie bei Antoninus Liberalis: Hesiod ist also die Vorlage nicht, was auch nicht zu erwarten war.' [1]

Even before the Coan tale came on the scene there was reason to regard these remarks as over-dogmatic. For example, since Ovid does not owe his details on Mestra to Kallimachos, what right had Wilamowitz to assume that the unknown source contained no details of Erysichthon himself?

There was one important point at which Wilamowitz' argument broke down. If Ovid knew only Kallimachos for the Erysichthon story, then the story contained no demise. It is only the punishment of Erysichthon which really justifies the idea of autophagy; the story of Mestra is merely an interlude which retards the action. Before we could draw on the Coan congener the language of the Etymologicum Magnum *s.v.* αἴθων already suggested that autophagy had appeared in a Greek version: καὶ αἴθωνα λιμόν, τὸν μέγαν, ἢ ἑαυτὸν φονεύοντα. This is rather important, for elsewhere the motif seems to occur only in Latin texts. Juvenal, *Sat.* xv. 102-3, which is based on Ovid, has already been mentioned: 'membra aliena fame lacerabant, *ĕsse parati/et sua*'. *Declam.* xii. 8 of pseudo-Quintilian also alluded to it: 'non habitabant una pudor et fames . . . *memetipsum, si nihil fuisset aliud, comedissem*'. Latin also provides an example of the parallel idea that men will drink their blood to seek to quench violent thirst; Aulus treads on a *dipsas* and is bitten: 'nec sentit fatique genus mortemque ueneni,/ sed putat esse sitim; ferroque aperire tumentes/ sustinuit uenas atque os implere cruore' [2]. It was therefore possible to feel that we are dealing with a specifically Roman idea, for the Etymologicum Magnum is not a witness of flawless character. But when the motif is found in Dante, in the episode of Ugolino in the Tower of Hunger [3], would it only make sense to scholars of Latin? 'Ambo le man per lo dolor mi morsi./ Ed ei (his sons and grandsons), pensando ch'io 'l fessi per voglia/ Di manicar, . . .' I should prefer to think that the idea cannot be

---

[1] *Hell. Dicht.* II, p. 43.
[2] Lucan, *Phars.* ix. 758 ff.
[3] *Inferno* Canto 33, esp. lines 58-60. Cf. T. Spencer, *Speculum* 9 (1934), 295-301 (esp. 297); F. A. Yates, *Journ. Warburg and Courtauld Inst.* 14 (1951), 92-117.

limited to one society, and this is also the conclusion to be drawn from its appearance in the Coan story. We should therefore not hesitate to ascribe it to the Greek versions of Erysichthon.

Many of the details of Ovid's inventiveness, as conceived by Wilamowitz, should now cease to carry weight. The view in particular that Ovid's oak is prompted solely by the fact that 'eine Pappel ist dem Italiener nicht vornehm genug' is singularly unhappy, for, *a priori*, it is the poplar of Kallimachos which stands a good chance of being distinctive, and we shall see in the next section that he had special reasons for breaking with tradition. At the same time, there were features which we seemed required to attribute to the Roman; for example, *Fames*, 'das Prachtstück seiner Erfindung', as Wilamowitz thought. To De Cola (pp. 69 f.) this was 'one of those allegorical scenes dear to Latin poetry in which our poet excels'; to Zielinski (1. 144) this was one safe anchorage on a very turbulent sea: 'Jedenfalls werde ich wohl Recht haben mit der Behauptung, dass diese Behandlung der Personifikation spezifisch römisch ist'. Arens (p. 115) also sees it as a new personification, not borrowed from mythology, and 'typically Ovidian'. The model of Vergil's *Fama* (*Aen.* 4. 179 ff.) seemed patent [1], while Ovid's treatment of *Invidia* (*Met.* 2. 760 ff.) and *Somnus* (11. 592 ff.) seemed to shout aloud that here Ovid was 'a star with his own light' [2].

For a total picture which seemed to explain the treatment successfully within the poet's own environment, we must go to Diller and Büchner, particularly the latter (pp. 216 ff.). Point after point is fitted into the Latin tradition, with Fames' *modus operandi*, for instance, described by Ovid with the same interest in the pathological that Lucretius shows in describing the appearance of dreams in Book 4. Occasionally there is a turn of phrase which suggests the restricted ideas of Wilamowitz: '*Mit der Geschichte des Kallimachos als Vorgang* hat Ovids Fames allerdings wenig zu tun, ja nichts, ausser dass es sich um Hunger handelt' [3] (my italics). We shall in fact see that the personification of Ravening Hunger is an integral part of Kallimachos' thinking. And what are we to say now that we have the independent testimony of Kos?

---

[1] Heinze, p. 12 n. 2; Malten, p. 552 n. 2; Korn-Ehwald *ad Met.* 8. 788; Ehwald, Bursian 80 (1894), 39.

[2] Wilamowitz, *Hell. Dicht.* II, p. 44. Cf. Arens, pp. 114, 186.

[3] P. 215.

'Then suddenly he sees something afar off moving very slowly and coming towards him. Presently it came near him, and what does he see? It was an old woman, hunchbacked as a hook, and her hair in its filth hung disordered on her scabby head; her forehead was all wrinkled, covered with a scaly rust; her eyebrows had half fallen out and were hardly to be seen for pimples and pustules; her eyes were sunken deep as though in basins; her nose was eaten away—far and away may this be from us!—by gnawing ulcers; her mug was as yellow as a sulphur candle; her lips were white and black, covered with slaver; her teeth were like axes hung up in a row, dirty black and all rotted into holes; her body was skin and bone; her ribs you could count, so lean was she; inside her you could see her entrails; the bones of her hips in broken array stuck out like dugs; where the joints should fit they were coming apart, she was so decrepit; the cap-bones of her knees seemed to stand out like the pulleys in wells; she was altogether a terrible old maumet.' (p. 339)

The conclusion is inescapable that here for once folklore has contributed a good deal. The murder of the pious rebel, by which Erysichthon's criminal activities are intensified [1], Ravening Hunger, even the bleeding and groaning of the oak [2], have come to Ovid readymade. There was of course room for refinement: the oak with its ex-voto tablets and fillets [3], the nymphs in mourning clothes [4], the 'demythologizing' of Ceres as the spirit of Fruitfulness [5]. But of the rest we can only say that it lent itself to treatment in the Ovidian manner.

This is so unexpected a conclusion to have to reach, that it will not go amiss to refer again to the qualifications of the Coan story. The idea that the folktale is really based upon both Kallimachos and Ovid, a double literary contact, was dismissed by Dawkins (p. 348) as 'almost impossible'. He reminded us that Kos was a part of the Greek world 'which has been continuously inhabited by Greeks since antiquity, and has been kept from the great shifts of population and peoples which must never be quite out of our minds when we are dealing with many parts of Greece'. The integrity of the folktale therefore has a right to be recognized.

[1] So, for example, Wilamowitz, Heinze, Malten, Lafaye (p. 136).

[2] See Frazer, *Golden Bough*[3], I. ii pp. 7-45, and Mannhardt, *Wald- und Feldkulte* I, pp. 34-8, 40-2, II, pp. 20 f., for these as widespread motifs. It took a clever poet to infuse new life into the idea, but Vergil succeeded (*Aen.* 3. 22 ff.).

[3] Cf. C. Boetticher, *Der Baumkultus der Hellenen* (1856), pp. 19 f., 61 f. He compares *inter alia* Ov. *Fast.* 3. 267 ff.

[4] Cf. *Met.* 6. 288, 568; 8. 448.

[5] See Korn-Ehwald *ad Met.* 8. 785; Arens, p. 115. Lines 784-6 and 793 are assuredly the poet's own work, also the overdrawn image in 809-12 (cf. Met. 2. 766 f., 785 f.; 11. 630-2), although I have already suggested that the technique is shared with the folktale.

We may still ask about the connexions of both poets with the ancient version to which the Coan tale testifies. Dawkins, when carefully weighing every point, remarked that 'Callimachus is not a very likely author to have come into contact with popular story-telling, and Ovid is of the West and not of the East' (p. 348). Such thoughts did not stop him from finally accepting the authenticity of the tale, and it would be wrong if others leaned more heavily on them. To take the case of Ovid first. The geographical distinction can mislead, for when the poet uses the story of Philemon and Baucis, immediately before the Erysichthon story, he is, in Dawkins' sense, of the East. The tale is Phrygian in origin [1]. But, of course, it comes to the poet more probably as a literary subject than as an oral tale; we cannot dismiss the latter possibility, but we must not let it colour our thinking to the point where we deny the source simply because of the distance involved.

For the antecedents of so many stories which have a basis in folklore we are at the mercy of our surviving literature. It is worth reminding ourselves of how much we know that we have lost —and how much we do *not* know—when we think of the Erysichthon story. Apollonios' works on the founding of Knidos and Rhodes, Nicander's *Heteroiumena*, Parthenios' *Metamorphoses*, Antigonos' *Alloiōseis*, the *Metamorphoses* of Theodorus, Didymarchus and —if we can trust the pseudo-Plutarchan *Parallela*—of Kallisthenes and Dorotheos, the mythological handbook of C. Julius Theopompus of Knidos: somewhere in such a dry catalogue the line of Ovid's indebtedness could probably be traced. One has only, in addition, to compare the lacunose opening of (Lys.) *or.* 6 with the statement of Andokides [2], that the prosecution recited a blood-curdling (φρικώδης) list of past offenders of the Eleusinian divinities, to wonder how often such lists were used and how wide a net on this occasion the prosecution cast.

In Part B of this study I shall try to show that Kallimachos knew essentially the same story as Ovid, but that the harmony only becomes apparent in his manipulation of the plot for special effect. Kallimachos' knowledge of the Greek version which lies behind the Coan tale calls for a different argument from that which has been employed for Ovid. In the first place he was accus-

---

[1] Cf. Fontenrose, 'Philemon, Lot and Lycaon', *Univ. Calif. Publ. in Class. Philol.* xiii, 4 (1945), 93-120.

[2] *De Myst.* 29.

tomed to dip into works on local antiquities. There may still be some with a romantic outlook who are not prepared to forgive him for making this plain at fr. 75. 54 ff. In the second place a story based on Kos is something rather special. Rostovtzeff [1] talks of 'Soter and Philadelphos, who, like the members of their artistic and intellectual *entourage*, often spent their summer holiday on this fortunate island, as at the present day rich citizens of Alexandria and Cairo like to retire to Rhodes in summer'. The precise evidence for this I do not know, but, if it is a guess, it is an intelligent one. Whether it was Kallimachos' good fortune or not, it does not pay to forget the close links forged between Ptolemy and his birthplace, Kos, nor the Hellenistic literary figures who had contacts with the island. Theokritos was numbered among them, also the great Philitas, tutor to Philadelphos, who must surely have come to Alexandria. And if it was not Philadelphos, nor one of the literary circle, nor a work on antiquities, nor firsthand knowledge from a visit to the island that brought him in contact with the story, then there were always other visitors and travellers whom—the fragments of the *Aitia* tell us more than once—Kallimachos regarded as a mine of information. It should, therefore, occasion no surprise if Kallimachos has renovated a local legend from this island. The source would add piquancy to his treatment, and undoubtedly commend the tale the more to his favourite audience, Philadelphos [2].

---

[1] *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, p. 237.

[2] The more so because of Philadelphos' interest in the festivals of the Cnidian Triopion (Schol. Theocr. 17. 68/9a).

Part B

KALLIMACHOS AND ERYSICHTHON

Basic Assumptions: 1. *The Complexity of H.* 6.

The complexities of H. 5, the companion piece to H. 6, and the complexities of the Erysichthon story itself invite the conclusion that, if Kallimachos' treatment of the tale seems simple and straightforward, we *may* in fact have been seduced by an ocular illusion. I shall argue in this part of the study that, while H. 6 is comedy, the greater part of the humour is subterranean, for in this poetry the allusive and the elusive go hand in hand. To Kallimachos comedy is a game of learned 'hide-and-seek'.

Perhaps I should anticipate right at the beginning an obvious objection to the following pages: the idea that even a Hellenistic poet could mix so rich a trifle as I suggest surpasses belief. It will later become clear, I think, that the 'leg-pulls' which the poet uses in Hs. 2, 5 and 6, that is, the encouragement which he gives us to believe that his poems will follow a different course, conform to a definite pattern. In H. 2 the 'leg-pull' emerges at line 105 [1], when the audience belatedly realize through the recall of an actual incident that Kallimachos' Delian Apollo is his patron, Ptolemy; here it occurs at the *end*. In H. 5 it appears at line 95, but for the discerning possibly at the ambiguous 79, which in a composition of 142 lines may roughly, but reasonably, be called the ***middle***. In H. 6 it occurs at line 17, the ***beginning***. I take it that no critic will be captious enough to object that line 1 is the beginning, for a situation must be created before it can be sabotaged by the poet. By line 17 we have grown to expect a threnodic treatment of some aspect of Demeter's wanderings, and in a poem of 138 lines this may well pass for the beginning.

Can, by any stretch of the imagination, 'leg-pulls' at beginning, middle and end—the only three definable points of a composition—

---

[1] Cf. *PaP*, p. 50. If the reader feels that judgment must be reserved until a later study on H. 2, I hope that he will then recall this discussion.

be considered accidental? I think not, and it is the 'leg-pull' at the beginning which is most striking. The technical difficulties in creating this situation, above all the sheer extravagance of it if the poet has no compelling reason for its use, suggest to me that Kallimachos is here completing a trio [1]. He has already exploited middle and end; now he will turn to the point of greatest challenge. Now we must couple this situation with the concept of Callimachean mischief, on which in fact it hangs. If I am right in seeing mischief as the outstanding characteristic of the Hymns, a moment's reflexion will suggest two things: his audience or his readers (for it is difficult sometimes to keep these two categories as sharply apart as they should be kept) must have become progressively more and more alert to this mischief, and similarly to the idea of a 'leg-pull'. I suspect that they were ready for both in H. 6, but that they were not ready to encounter them at the beginning. Before they had mastered the situation, Kallimachos had accomplished his first purpose. He could not, of course, leave it there; he must develop the hymn in an appropriate manner, by telling 'the cautionary tale' of Erysichthon. Assuredly Kallimachos now faced his sternest and most dogged critics. If the mischief of this tale is both subterranean and kaleidoscopic it is for this reason: they would have loved to 'cut the poet down to size'.

Perhaps 'leg-pull' needs a defence. Some have already found it so familiar, indeed so coarse, as to suggest that I am approaching Kallimachos with the fine feelings of a bull among Delftware. It is, in the first place, all too easy to enshrine surviving literary pieces according to a transmitted standard and to see a sacrilegious hand in a radical reappraisal of their worth. It sometimes turns out—as with the *Hymns* of our poet—that our pearls are rarer than we think. I know of one ancient statue which was improved by the transfer of a fragment from the nose to the elbow, and it is not before time that we realized the uniqueness of these poems, however drastic the necessary surgery may seem.

In the second place, it is worth observing that a colloquial expression is forced upon me by the sauciness of Kallimachos'

---

[1] This is not the only way of presenting this viewpoint, but it is the most cogent for the moment. Later it will be argued from this angle: the way in which Kallimachos uses the epiphany atmosphere in H. 2 is only intelligible on the assumption that this hymn is the earliest of the trio, while H. 6 hangs on H. 5.

treatment. The technique is so novel in Greek literature that I am necessarily handicapped by the absence of an established technical language for its criticism as literature. While we may think of the result as in some respects a riddle or *griphos* writ large, this field of literature also is still without a definitive investigation, as E. Diehl had cause to lament in 1936 (*Wien. Stud.* 54, 147 n. 21). Since the major obstacle to the decipherment of this type of composition, on both small and large scales, is precisely the failure to realize that we are confronted with examples of it, the task would not prove easy. Precisely because the language admits of a sense on the surface we are ready to acquiesce and look no further.

But, most important, we must remember that it is a *technique*, and does not exist apart from a satisfying subject for its use. Neither the poet's gratitude in H. 2 nor the literary exercise in Hs. 5 and 6 is an essentially *flippant* subject, quite the contrary. But Kallimachos is no ordinary toastmaster, nor is fulmination his only tone for literary criticism. We are led to believe that his answer to a challenge to his capabilities was to compose the *Hecale*. Hs. 5 and 6 seem to me no less practical in intent (on which more will be said presently), to outdo his opponents and, with the help of his new technique (new at least for compositions of this length), to hoist them with their own petard, expose their inferior critical powers. The 'leg-pull' gives the poet for us a special interest, but it is only a clever and engaging means to an end; it is essentially the circumstances under which it was used which made it attractively refreshing to a Ptolemy in the poet's 'Thank You', but disconcerting to his rivals in the later literary exercises.

2. *Comedy and Motivation*

I see the tale as a theme for comedy, as much as the hunger of Herakles. Indeed, as I have mentioned, there is now a more substantial case to be made for the belief that the subject had already been treated in this spirit in the satyr-comedy of Achaios. That Kallimachos intended his treatment to be finally appraised from this viewpoint should have been apparent even in the general character of his volteface at the opening. He will not sing of what brought tears to the goddess, the Sorrows of Demeter (17). Instead he will sing of *one of her Joys* (can we avoid this conclusion ?)—Demeter Θεσμοφόρος, the lawgiver who turned men from cannibalism to civilized living, Demeter who gave men grain and agriculture

or—surely it comes with a jolt, even though line 23 is lacunose—Demeter and the Rake's Ruin. The last subject should immediately strike us as differing *toto caelo* from those preceding it. A Joy of Demeter? Even a Benefit of the Goddess (to use a less partisan word)? No, the Erysichthon story is not calculated to make a humane goddess smile. But Kallimachos' treatment will! Formally addressed to Demeter, it is his 'offering', in the lighthearted spirit of those who have already mourned and fasted with the goddess, and now release their emotions.

In the *Poet at Play* (pp. 106 ff.) I have discussed already the role of the ritual opening and the way in which Kallimachos motivates an early 'leg-pull' which does not destroy the artistic unity of his composition, by the use of Hesperos. The appearance of the Evening Star, which closes the period of commemorative fasting and mourning and ushers in the exultant final stage of the Thesmophoria, is integrated with, and explained through a mythological Hesperos who takes over Iambe's canonical role and transforms Demeter's mourning into mirth. So the poet may discard the threnodic note on which he opened and turn instead to burlesque. If we have missed the cunning reminder of Iambe in a Hesperos who stills the goddess's grief, we have missed a good deal; for it was in memory of the action of Iambe that women at the Thesmophoria were accustomed to indulge in raillery, abuse and banter [1]. The tenor of the poet's treatment is hence dictated to him.

Prof. Verdenius has drawn my attention to the particularly happy use of subject for such a moment. The duration of fasting at the Greek Thesmophoria is obscure, but there is evidence that in some parts of the world it lasted for *nine* days [2], the length of time which is suggested by the Homeric Hymn [3]. It would then go almost without saying that the subject of food was attractive to the devotees! Further, he has pointed out that such a thought will give a natural motivation to Kallimachos' remark that the tale is a cautionary one (22): ἵνα καί τις ὑπερβασίας ἀλέηται. In the Fifth Hymn the 'cautionary tale' appears because the poet's 'leg-pull' is yet to come; he gives us a chance to take him seriously. When we find a humane Athene at work, we discover that there is really no *non-sequitur*, for the prior caution was given to the men,

[1] Σκώπτειν, αἰσχρολογεῖν. See Apollod. *Bibl.* I. 5. I, Diod. Sic. V. 4. 7.
[2] Cf. Allen-Halliday on H. H. *Dem.* 47 (p. 135).
[3] *Dem.* 49-50.

not to the women to whom the tale is told. We have jumped to the conclusion that the tale is cautionary *without being told so.* Now in the Sixth Hymn the 'leg-pull' has already occurred, at line 17. If the poet *expressly* calls his story a cautionary tale, and we find good cause to reject the notion that traditional respect for the pantheon is upheld by Kallimachos, then motivation seems to break down. Verdenius, however, succeeded in avoiding the poet's trap in ὑπερβασίας; no normal transgressions are involved, but 'overstepping the mark' in a direction which we must ourselves supply—eating! 'The fast is over, girls, but don't make pigs of yourselves. Remember what happened to Erysichthon. You may find it hard to stop!'

3. *Piety and the Poet's Irony*

To us it may seem almost incredible that Kallimachos should contemplate turning such a subject, starvation, always a bedfellow of Hellas, into a theme for burlesque. I would not be surprised if to some it seems to imperil my argument, which runs counter to so many evaluations of H. 6. It is worthwhile to give some illustrations of these. Hs. 5 and 6, wrote Erbse [1], 'lassen eine Gottheit sehen, die beim Leser echten Schauder erweckt. Es ist ja nicht so, dass diese exzeptionelle und sehr individuelle Form der Erzählung von den Göttern, die Kallimachos hier nach- und umbildend vorführt, Jovialität oder wenigstens religiöse Indifferenz voraussetzt'. Similarly Cahen [2] believed that the poet chose the story of Erysichthon because 'elle illustrait au mieux la figure à la fois bienfaisante et terrible de la déesse qu'il proposait à l'exaltation religieuse des dévotes de Déméter'.

Those who believe that there is always 'ein Schimmer des Göttlichen' [3] in the Hymn have predominated. There are not only works such as Heinrich Staehelin's *Die Religion des Kallimachos* [4], where the 'glimmer' is kept shining by making a distinction between a merry mood of the poet when handling the gods as purely mythological figures and high seriousness when they are representatives of actual divine power (as in the Epiphany Hymns)—an idea which has not commended itself to those who still respect to a

[1] *Herm.* 83 (1955), 416.
[2] *Call.*, p. 389.
[3] Erbse, *op. cit.*, p. 414.
[4] Diss. Zürich 1934.

measure the traditional standpoint [1]; but also works with the stature of F. Altheim's *Epochen der römischen Geschichte II*: *Weltherrschaft und Krise* [2]. Altheim dismisses promptly the idea that the treatment of Erysichthon is *burleskgruselig*, for he sees it as truest myth:

> 'Denn wiederum formt sich das Wesen der Göttin: Sie, die gütige und huldreiche, die Schützerin der Ihren — sie kann zugleich auch die furchtbare und rächende sein. Beide Seiten bedingen sich, und erst ihre Verbindung macht das gesamte demetrische Dasein aus. Überhaupt scheint mir Kallimachos weit davon entfernt, mit dem Mythos ein wie auch immer geartetes Spiel zu treiben. Er nimmt ihn ernst, er erfasst ihn tief und mit sicherem Empfinden für das Entscheidende.'

This approach, to be carried further by Kleinknecht [3] and Erbse, involves an obvious judgment on the tone of the composition, that it must move us to pity and fear.

But no less is there implicit the idea that Kallimachos' treatment of his material is transparently simple. Some have said this openly. To Couat [4] the Erysichthon story is 'un chef-d'oeuvre de simplicité et de naturel'. Howald, when discussing the section from the infliction of Ravening Hunger up to Erysichthon's abandonment as a beggar, remarks [5]: 'Dieser Teil der E-geschichte braucht keine Erklärung: alle Gelehrsamkeit ist davon ferngehalten'. Cahen [6] drastically reduces the mythological content of the Hymns: 'Les Hymnes V et VI en contiennent tres peu. L'histoire qui remplit, ici ou là, la plus grande partie de la pièce, est contée dans l'hymne *à Déméter* sans presque d'allusions à d'autres faits de la légende'. None of these conclusions—genuine piety, genuine pathos, simple treatment—seems to me tenable for longer than a moment.

The contrast with Teiresias in H. 5 should show us that there are academic questions involved. Erysichthon, as a deliberate offender, forfeits any claim on our pity, as Ovid [7] also knew: '(Ceres) moliturque genus poenae miserabile, si non/ille suis esset nulli miserabilis actis,/pestifera lacerare Fame'. Now when

---

[1] Cf. H. Herter, Bursian 255 (1937), p. 193; C. E. Visser, *Götter und Kulte im Ptolemäischen Alexandrien* (Diss. Amsterdam 1938), pp. 50-58.

[2] Frankfurt am Main 1935, pp. 130 ff.

[3] For H. 5 (*Herm.* 50 (1939), 301-350).

[4] *La Poésie Alexandrine*, p. 284. The phrase found at least one appreciative audience: 'un capolavoro di semplicità e di naturalezza' (De Cola, p. 67).

[5] *Der Dichter Kallimachos von Kyrene*, p. 59.

[6] *Call.*, p. 356.

[7] *Met.* 8. 782 ff.

tragedy goes out, comedy may come in, that same type of comedy which the poet has already found in the hunger of Herakles at H. 3. 146-161 [1]. He has chosen for his performance a women's festival and mystery religion. This combination, which of course automatically excluded Kallimachos from personal participation, should be already enough to indicate the degree of academic detachment in his reconstruction, and to cast doubts on even dormant sincerity.

However to concentrate on the poet's attitude to a religious theme is to obscure the big principles at issue in the Sixth Hymn. If there is a mischievous Kallimachos at work, as I postulate, his success is due to, and based on the fact that it is human nature to treat such suffering as tragic and *to read this interpretation into his poem.* If we do not observe the way in which Kallimachos has calculatingly modified the emphases of H. 6, we may imagine that the theme of superficial pathos which is accentuated in H. 5 also is to be read into the later composition. When Lydgate in his *Fall of Princes* presented Boccacio's classic in an English dress, this evaluation of the Erysichthon story was already current: 'Allas, poor prince, was it nat pitie, To see him die in such adversitie'. Ovid's humour, to be sure, is here rather more restrained, but the

---

[1] I choose this example not simply because Herakles (and his hunger) was a favourite subject of the Doric comedy of Epicharmos, nor again because of the poet's dispassionate treatment of the subject, but because here also the poet may be ringing the changes. In Theokritos' Encomion on Philadelphos (17. 20-33) Herakles is presented as the ancester of both Alexander and Ptolemy; not surprisingly then he leads a heroic existence in the divine society. When he leaves the feast *after having his fill,* one servant takes his bow and quiver, another his club, and they escort him to Hebe's boudoir. Gow at least toyed with the idea that Herakles' appearance in *Idd.* 24 and (if genuine) 25 owes something to the descent claimed by the Lagids (*Theocritus* II pp. 326, 415, 418; cf. p. 546 on Epigr. 22). In Kallimachos it is famished Herakles, no less ravenous than before his deification, who plays butler's assistant, ready to commandeer the game which Artemis has brought. This scene, which reduces even implacable Hera to laughter, shows an ironical use of the high style when the 'starveling' is described as 'the anvil of Tiryns' (3. 146); Theocr. 13 (*Hylas*) provides some good examples with a contrasting tone: Ἀμφιτρύωνος ὁ χαλκεοκάρδιος υἱός (5), ὁ ταλαεργὸς ἀνὴρ . . . . Ἀλκμήνας υἱὸς Μιδεάτιδος ἡρωΐνας (19-20), Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδας (55). Whether H. 3 is concerned with affairs of the court or not, I would still be inclined to ask whether Kallimachos is not securely enough entrenched in royal favour to dare to combat a literary tendency, if not a particular stuffy colleague, with a hint that 'Having Herakles as an ancestor is a mixed blessing, you know!'

medieval reaction to him was no better founded than the modern to Kallimachos.

We must constantly be alive to what the poet says. If we are expected, for example, to draw the conclusion of Altheim [1], that 'was unter den Menschen die Gemeinde der Gläubigen, in der Natur ist es der Hain der Göttin mit seinem Frieden und seiner Abgeschiedenheit', then we have a right to complain, for about the last two ideas the poet has nothing to say at all. We have taken the liberty of drawing a conclusion about the function of the grove, without proper examination of the validity of our premises. We shall see that the poet makes such an appeal to our intellects—and I think now only of those examples which will not involve me in the risky business of anticipating the poet's post-prandial comments—that we are really kept too busy to give our feelings free play for long. And yet this conflict remains, of a subject that invites our pity and a treatment, which, by its innuendoes and careful phraseology, rejects it.

To say that this is fundamentally a serious question, worthy of the attention of the *Poetics*, is to say a good deal. This is not the first time that the question of what constitutes a tragic character had occupied men's minds. But if this was the whole story I doubt whether even a Kallimachos would have devised this extravagant form to elucidate the problem. Perhaps H. Langerbeck [2] may be thought to provide a solution which harmonizes with the Hellenistic mentality. After observing that the poet of this age 'sich von der Emotionalität als solcher ironisch distanziert', he adds the penetrating remark:

> 'Dass alle diese Dichter lebhaft und tief empfanden—nur ein Barbar wird es leugnen—, ändert das etwas daran, dass das, was ihrem Werk die Form gibt, das Wissen von *der Komik aller Emotionalität* ist?' (My italics)

I think that this remark is undoubtedly true, and that we must remember it always when dealing with Kallimachos. But it should be as true of the restrained Fifth Hymn as of the Sixth. In itself it is not sufficient to explain the distinction.

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 131. Cf. *PaP*, pp. 93 f. for a similar observation by Prof. Howald. It is easy, but fatal, to read into H. 6 the tone of H. 5, also that of parts of Ovid's treatment. Cf. Büchner, *Humanitas Romana*, pp. 210 f., for some good remarks on the way in which Ovid really does make it plain that his oak is a holy tree.

[2] *Gnomon* 28 (1956), 492.

I doubt whether such a question would receive latent discussion in this composition, had not someone—and someone who mattered—treated the theme as tragedy. Naturally I cannot require the reader's consent to this solution, much less to the suggestion made in *The Poet at Play* [1], that Antimachos was the culprit. I can only reiterate that that poet's *Lyde* described the sufferings of ancient heroes and heroines in a manner which was supposed, by comparison, to alleviate the author's suffering over the death of his wife; that Quintilian found it tasteless stuff; that some of Kallimachos' enemies admired it, while he did not. I have suggested that Antimachos had treated the story of Teiresias' blinding in the savage Pherecydean version and that Kallimachos, in the same metre, sets out to teach his opponents how such a subject should be handled, with formal respect for the humanity of Athene and logical respect for the incident itself. Since H. 6 is a companion piece to H. 5, I cannot resist the feeling that Antimachos had treated Erysichthon as a tragic figure, a viewpoint which Kallimachos opposes, no less by his change of metre than in other ways.

The fact of this conflict seems to me to exist, regardless of the merits of these ideas. Among the passages treated in this study I invite the reader to consider 113-7 as a test case. Erysichthon's abandonment might normally be expected to move us to pity, the pious protestation of the narrator to spring from genuine revulsion. De Cola [2] finds 'tragic simplicity' in 113-5; Cahen [3] talks of 'le tableau pitoyable des vv. 114-115'. But if I am right in my analysis of 117 then such ideas can no longer be entertained.

General Motivation

On the surface the most surprising innovation in Kallimachos' treatment is the domestic situation which he creates. 'Der Kosmos, den er so aufbaut, wird durch die Schuld des Erysichthon allmählich ganz verstört. Das ist der Sinn der Geschichte. Dies alles stellt Diller ein für allemal mit Recht fest' [4]. But Büchner saw something further, that *we* must construct this World with the building material which the poet supplies, that Kallimachos himself '*begins to tell his tale as if everything was known*'. We pick up on the way

[1] Pp. 102 ff., also p. 105 n. 1.
[2] P. 70.
[3] *Comm.*, p. 273.
[4] Büchner, p. 208.

the information that Erysichthon wishes to build a banqueting hall, the arrangement of his household, the property of the family, and 'quite at the end we hear that Erysichthon was the king's son, who became a beggar'. Now to recognize the apparently casual way in which the poet proceeds in his story is a forward step, but it should be accompanied by the realization—even at this level—that Kallimachos' leisurely progress goes hand in hand with a manipulation of the story. For the larger questions at issue it should also not escape our notice that where the poet is so allusive and we must reconstruct, there is ample opportunity for 'jerry-building'.

Why, for example, is the villain 'the king's son' only at the end? The detail would be known to the audience, and a good deal more besides. Here the feature is postponed for literary effect. Kallimachos knows, and perhaps his hearers do too, that there are versions which make Triopas responsible, and others which credit Erysichthon with the offence. The Coan congener shows how easy it was to involve both father and son in acts of villainy. Moreover, if there was interplay between the Triopases of mythology, it might be remembered that, while Triopas of Argos was held in honour [1], Triopas, king of the Perrhaebians, was a most unpleasant character [2]. In the presence of such forms of complexity Kallimachos has decided that the most whimsical situation could be created by playing off a *shameless* son against *shamefaced* parents. The shamelessness of Erysichthon is a natural thought, manifest at 36 ἀναιδέες, 45 κακὸν καὶ ἀναιδέα φῶτα, implicit at 50-55 in his savage glare, his disregard for Demeter's priestess and the violence that he threatens, also in 63 κύον κύον [3].

---

[1] At Paus. iv 1. 1-2 Polykaon marries Messene, daughter of Triopas from Argos. 'Messene, being proud of her origin, for her father was the chief of the Greeks of his day in reputation and power', would not allow her husband to remain a private citizen. The date of Messene's admission into Triopas' family—of course a question of politics—is not as important to us as the attitude.

[2] The Townleian Scholiast at *Il.* 4. 88 (cf. Eustath. 448, 11) ascribes Pandaros' breach of the truce to 'bad blood'. An ancestor, Karnabas, had killed his grandfather, Triopas, the cruel king of the Perrhaebians, and had received a reward from the grateful citizens. Fleeing to Brenthis in Trojan territory he was purified by Tros and founded Zeleia. This localization contradicts his Lycian connexions, but, as Nilsson (*Mycenean Origin of Greek Mythology*, p. 58) argues, reflects early ignorance about the south of Asia Minor after the Mycenean period, and the consequent transplanting of the Lycians as allies of the Trojans to the neighbourhood of Troy. Cf. W. Leaf, *Strabo on the Troad*, pp. 63-68.

[3] Roscher (*Rhein. Mus.* 53 (1898), 169-204, especially 169 n. 2, 186 f.)

His 'shamefaced parents' is surely a new idea. It is apparent at 73 αἰδόμενοι and, by implication, in most of the following lines (especially in the Excuses of 72-86 and ἐνδόμυχος at 87), at 111 f., and above all in 114 ὁ τῶ βασιλῆος. The Parents' Shame is complete at the exposure of the monster, when the king's son becomes a beggar. This is a bourgeois dénouement to the story: 'Oh the shame of it! What will the neighbours say!' This is why the poet postpones mention of the relationship between Triopas and the community; it is artistically more effective to leave it until this late point. Here as often there is reason to lament the inattention that has been paid to the way that Kallimachos motivates his action: a casual phrase, a commonplace, is found to be cardinal for the interpretation, to be employed with a delicate sense of timing, and often to require a revaluation of something taken for granted.

At the same time Kallimachos cleverly underlines his idea by devoting a whole line to the simple thought of 'beggar':

αἰτίζων ἀκόλως τε καὶ ἔκβολα λύματα δαιτός (115)

The first two words are taken from Od. 17. 222 [1], where they describe Odysseus; the last two are a transformation of Od. 17. 220 [2]: δαιτῶν ἀπολυμαντῆρα. This latter reference has not been utilized by the commentators, but the reinforcing of a simple idea by welding together two texts is thoroughly Callimachean. We shall meet it

---

connects the use of the word with the disease called κύων (κυνώδης ὄρεξις = ὄρεξις σφοδρὰ καὶ ἄπαυστος σιτίων Galen. xvii B p. 499, vii p. 131 K). This association had already been made by Spanheim, comparing H. 6. 116. However the repetition invites comparison only with fr. 75. 4, where the dominant idea is shamelessness.

[1] (ὃς πολλῇσι φλιῇσι παραστὰς φλίψεται ὤμους) αἰτίζων ἀκόλους, οὐκ ἄορας οὐδὲ λέβητας.

[2] Cf. 377. If I am right we see how Kallimachos interpreted ἀπολυμαντήρ, not as 'kill-joy' or the like, but in its medico-religious sense. 'Probably the poor, in eating Ἑκάτης δεῖπνον,—at once an offering and a vehicle of aversion,—ran the risk of transference of evil to themselves rather than starve' (J. A. MacCulloch, Hastings' *ERE.*, 4. 335). Cf. Plut. *de Superst.* 10, Theophr. *Char.* 16; L. Moulinier, *Le pur et l'impur dans la pensée des Grecs* (1952), pp. 93, 99 f. That is to say, at the crossroads Erysichthon dined on what was thrown out after the regular purification of the house, something more disgusting to the average Greek because it was tainted with ritual impurity than because it was offal. T. A. Sinclair, *Festschrift Dornseiff*, pp. 330-3, argued against this sense for ἀπολυμαντήρ, but I prefer the explanation of E. Mireaux (*La Vie quotidienne au temps d'Homère*, 1954, pp. 255-9; Eng. trans. 1959, pp. 253-6). Kallimachos' reference to the Homeric *pharmakos* reminds us of the unsavoury refuse available at the crossroads and underlines the better the shame of Erysichthon's parents.

again in line 34. The concealment of Erysichthon (ἐνδόμυχος 87) may owe something to Pindar [1] ἀλλοτρίοισιν μὴ προφαίνειν, τίς φέρεται | μόχθος ἄμμιν· . . . . . εἰ δέ τις ἀνθρώ|ποισι θεόσδοτος † ἀτλη-κηκότας (ἀτλάτα κακότας Boeckh) προστύχῃ, ταύταν σκότει κρύπτειν ἔοικεν, the inevitable outcome to *Od.* 17. 286-7 γαστέρα δ'οὔ πως ἔστιν ἀποκρύψαι μεμαυῖαν. But the picture of his parents' shame in general is assuredly Kallimachos' own invention, introducing the specialised humour of the mime, such as we see in Theokritos' magnificent Fifteenth Idyll.

Furthermore, for his bourgeois setting, the poet has transformed Erysichthon. As the father of a marriageable daughter, Mestra, he should be no mere youth, but such the poet has made him. Lines 46-7, with the triple use of τέκνον, would not be significant on their own (for it is a *façon de parler* of the 'older generation' [2]), nor βρέφος at line 100 (for parents may, for a poet's comic effects, forget that their children grow up), but line 56 with παῖς is unequivocal. 'Chez Callimaque Erysichthon est presque un enfant, tout près de ses parents, et un enfant gâté, πολύθεστος' [3]. Erysichthon now becomes a juvenile delinquent, the wild scion of a good stock; no unnatural monster, but a boy who has got an insane idea into his head. Like Paraibios' father he will cut down the tree ἀγηνορίῃ νεότητος [4], and in σεύατ' (33), ἔδραμον (36) Kallimachos has finely illustrated the story of the hotheads [5]. Antilochos' apology to Menelaos at *Il.* 23. 589 f. provides a good commentary:

οἶσθ', οἷαι νέου ἀνδρὸς ὑπερβασίαι τελέθουσιν·
κραιπνότερος μὲν γάρ τε νόος, λεπτὴ δέ τε μῆτις.

But we shall see that not all that I have written in this paragraph has a relevance which extends beyond the superficial pattern.

The Scene of the Crime

The insanity of Erysichthon's idea derives as much from the love which Demeter bears to his father (30) as from the sanctity of the grove which he will outrage. It is unfortunate that we do not know more about the former, moreover that the lacuna in line 23 blurs the picture of the following two lines:

---

[1] *Hymni* fr. 42 Snell.
[2] Cf. *P. Oxy.* xv. 1794. 1 (Page, *Gk. Lit. Pap.* no. 122) τέκος τέκος.
[3] Cahen, *Call.*, p. 373.
[4] Ap. Rhod. II 475 ff.
[5] Cf. Gillies *ad* Ap. Rhod. III 158, where it is said of Eros: βῆ δὲ . . . θέων.

οὔπω τὰν Κνιδίαν, ἔτι Δώτιον ἱρὸν ἔναιον.
τὶν δ' αὐτᾷ καλὸν ἄλσος ἐποιήσαντο Πελασγοί . . .

Here we strike two difficulties, the subject of ἔναιον and the significance of αὐτᾷ. It has often been assumed, in answer to the former problem, that Kallimachos is representing the subsequent settlement of the house of Triopas at Knidos—and the foundation of the Triopion there in expiation— as a Pelasgian migration. This is the interpretation of, for example, Wilamowitz [1], Kern [2], A. B. Cook [3], and Howald [4] openly speaks of Triopas as king of the Pelasgians. Cahen [5] saw the obstacles for this idea. The Triopidai, he noted, were not, strictly speaking, Pelasgians; indeed Diodoros (V. 61) says that Triopas received the Dotian plain for his services in driving out the Thessalian Pelasgians when they warred with the sons of Deukalion. He remarked also on the gaucherie with which 25 follows 24. But nonetheless he translates with the Pelasgians as subject.

Others have found the subject of ἔναιον in the sorry relic at 23 π . . . . ἰδέσθαι, for it is reasonable to believe that Demeter's treatment of the Triopidai was mentioned there; this was the view of O. Schneider [6], E. Bethe [7] and—with greater authority—Jacoby [8], the latter observing: 'Die bezeichnung Αἰολίδας schliesst aus, dass er ihn (Triopas) fur einen Pelasger gehalten hat, wie eine falsche interpretation der eingangsverse 24 f . . . . behauptet'. When Büchner [9] adds a third possibility ('Demeter bewohnte, so erzählt Kallimachos, noch nicht Knidien, sondern das Land der Pelasger'), I assume that he has nodded, rather than emended the text. Now under other circumstances Triopas as king of Thessaly could have been described as 'Pelasgian' without confusion; the word is not uncommon as a poetic equivalent of 'Thessalian', with an echo of the Thessalian district of Pelasgiotis built into its sound [10]. But here a variety of considera-

[1] *Reden und Vorträge*³ (1913), p. 280; *Hell. Dicht.*, II p. 30 n. 1.
[2] *R.E.* vi. 572. 62.
[3] *Zeus* II p. 683.
[4] *Der Dichter Kallimachos von Kyrene*, p. 51. Similarly Howald-Staiger *ad loc.*
[5] *Comm.*, p. 263 and Budé edition *ad loc.*
[6] *Philol.* 6 (1851), 536.
[7] *Herm.* 24 (1889), 435.
[8] *Ad* Hellan. fr. 7; I (1923), p. 435.
[9] *Humanitas Romana*, p. 206.
[10] For the Thessalians as Πελασγοί cf. Ap. Rhod. I 580, II 1239, IV 265 f.

tions speak against its use. The syntax would be little short of sloppy, something which the Kallimachos of the Hymns only indulges in, I think, when he has a special trick up his sleeve. The Pelasgians are regularly represented as autochthonous peoples, and Hyginus [1] significantly says that the foundation (he thinks erroneously of a *templum*) was *ab antiquis collocatum*. The Dotian plain itself is of Pelasgian origin, for Dotos is made a son of Pelasgos [2]; while Triopas of Argos is credited with a son called Pelasgos we never hear his house described as Pelasgians. It is best, therefore, to interpret that Triopas has maintained a grove sacred to Demeter from remote antiquity, and that his son is insensitive to its age-old sanctity.

I have devoted some space to what may be considered a trifling question, not simply from a belief that the picture would be more sharply defined, were Erysichthon the son of one who came to the throne by conquest, but because the idea that Triopas was a foreigner—the Triopidai being distinct from the Pelasgians—would be possibly of importance if I am right in the interpretation of a later passage in the poem [3]. For the present it is sufficient to mention that in the Diodoran version already alluded to, where the Dotian plain is Triopas' reward, Triopas' starting-point was Rhodes and he is a son of Helios and Rhode.

The text of line 25 will not throw light on other parts of the composition, but the corrupt opening is worth a discussion in passing. Scholars object to either the abruptness of τίν (without an introductory vocative) or to the redundancy of αὐτᾷ. The former has been corrected by reading τεῖνδ' (Hecker), τεῖδ' (Schneider), τῇ δ' or τεῖ δ' (Wilamowitz), τῇδ' (Howald-Staiger), all Doric equivalents of 'here/there', while αὐτᾷ is maintained as 'for her'. The latter has been emended to 'Αγνά (Barber [4], but already by Schadewaldt [5]) or to τὶν δ' αὐτεῖ (Vollgraff). Prof. Verdenius struck out in a new direction by suggesting to me τεῖδ' αὐτεῖ, comparing for the double local adverb H. H. *Ap*. 374 κεῖθι αὐτοῦ, Sol. 36, 11

---

and for Πελασγοί in Thessaly see Hdt. I. 56-7; Strab. v. 2. 4; How-Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* I (1936), pp. 442-6; Allen, *Homeric Catalogue*, p. 108; Jacoby *ad* 4 (Hellanikos) F 4 (pp. 432 ff.).

[1] *Poet. Astr.* 2. 14.

[2] Herodianos *ap*. Steph. Byz. s.v. Δώτιον.

[3] Cf. pp. 110 ff.

[4] *C.R.* N.S. 4 (1954), 229.

[5] *Vide* Bursian 255 (1937), 208.

ἐνθάδ' αὐτοῦ (Ar. *Vesp.* 765, *Plut.* 1187). I would suggest that it is αὐτᾷ that is corrupt, and the solution is ἀντῇ, described by Hesychios as δῶρον ἱκέσιον: 'The Pelasgians built a fine grove [1] as an offering. .' This would provide a text which Cahen had already translated with his 'ils avaient consacré' [2]. It would be idle to speculate on whether the form is acc.sg.masc. or neuter plural— δῶρα can be found loosely applied to one object [3]—but the contraction may at first sight arouse misgivings. It is possible that the poet wrote ἀντέα with synizesis (cf. δημεχθέα fr. 486), but there is some evidence for Doric contraction in -η in literature and inscriptions [4]. Hesychios may therefore draw directly on Kallimachos as he does on other occasions.

The pattern of corruption would be simple: ἀντῇ was read as αὐτῇ, for which the Doric datival form αὐτᾷ was subsequently substituted. This suggested emendation would serve a double purpose, for it would allow us to remove the obelus which Latte placed against the word in Hesychios, suggesting that it was a corruption of ἄντημα. The next step would still involve some uncertainty. The idea of an offering most naturally calls for an indirect object, and for this reason I would preserve the τὶν δ'. If the abrupt use of the second person jars, it is always a possibility that there was an apostrophe in line 23, which perhaps began with π<ότνια,; this form occurs no fewer than ten times in the Hymns at the beginning of a verse [5]. Those who prefer to be guided by the dictum that this is 'an author who made it a principle never to write as the reader might reasonably suppose that he would' [6], would be free to return to a Doric local adverb.

The Pelasgian offering is depicted in an obviously individualistic manner. The grove contains pines, elms, peartrees and sweetapples so thickly planted that an arrow could scarcely pass through. From the channels water springs up, and, towering over all, a giant poplar strikes the eye. G. Méautis [7] would have us believe that this setting

---

1 Cf. Bacchyl. x[xi]. 111 ταὶ δ' αὐτίκα οἱ τέμενος βωμόν τε τεῦχον.

2 Budé edition. Cf. *Comm.*, p. 263, where he comments on the use of the middle: 'Les Pélasges ont fait de l'ἄλσος *leur* ἀνάθημα'.

3 Cf. *Il.* 14. 238; 20. 268; 21. 165, 594; 23. 297; Theogn. 1294.

4 Theocr. 1. 29 χείλη. See Cholmeley, *Theocritus* p. 424, for the inscriptional evidence.

5 3. 136, 210, 225, 259; 4. 123, 312; 5. 55, 86; 6. 10, 49. In all cases except the last it occurs in the vocative.

6 Powell-Barber, *New Chapters in Gk. Lit.*, II (1929), p. 1.

7 'Les bas-reliefs "pittoresques" et l'art Alexandrin', *Bronzes antiques du Canton de Neuchâtel*, 1928, p. 12.

shows a fondness for landscape, an idea which has been rightly rejected by C. M. Dawson [1]. Bethe [2] had already passed a judgment which summarizes the truth: 'Kallimachos war Stadtkind und Schulmeister, lebte und webte in der Bibliothek und im Museion zu Alexandreia, der Dünenstadt ohne Landschaft. Kein Wunder, dass Naturschilderung, gar Naturempfindung in seinen Gedichten sich schwerlich findet.' Of course, the idea that Kallimachos' grove owes something to the form of the sacred Hellenistic park [3] cannot be categorically denied. But the burning question is always whether such a picture is presented for its own sake or whether, as has often been suggested, his detail is a pointer to Kallimachos' use of literary allusion.

Legrand [4], for example, would turn this hymn into a pastiche of Theokritos. In H. 6. 44 ('À quoi bon des pavots dans les mains de Nikippa?' !) he sees an echo of the closing line of *Idyll* 7, in 27 ff. *Id.* 11. 45 f., in 74 ff. *Id.* 1. 77-81. The Cyclops' cave in *Id.* 11 is surrounded by bays, cypresses, ivy and a vine ἁ γλυκύκαρπος (with which Legrand would compare Kallimachos' γλυκύμαλα); there is also a spring fed by snow melting on Etna. 'La similitude de composition (quatre plantes d'abord, les plantes à fruits comestibles étant reservées pour la fin; puis l'eau courante) est frappante.' It is hard to believe that this idea really extends our horizons, except to warn us that, if there is a common form for describing such a scene, it may be in his choice of foliage that a poet shows his variations on the theme.

Cahen [5] pays more attention to the trees, finding some traits of Kalypso's grove in *Od.* 5. 238 ff. and some of Alkinoos' garden in *Od.* 7. 115 ff. He explains γλυκύμαλα as the product of literary contamination of μηλέαι ἀγλαόκαρποι (*Od.* 7. 115) and συκέαι γλυκεραί (7. 116). There is also contamination or reminiscence in the fact that πίτυς in H. 6. 27 is singular, while the other trees occur in the plural, for at *Od.* 5. 238 all are in the singular, at 7. 114 all in the plural. Again, there is reminiscence in αἴγειρος, μέγα δένδρεον αἰθέρι κῦρον (H. 6. 37), for the poplar occurs in Kalypso's wood

---

1 *Yale Class. Stud.* 9 (1944), 45.
2 SB. Leipzig 83 (1931). 2, p. 17.
3 Cf. Grimal, *R.E.L.* 16 (1938), 158; Wilamowitz, *Hell. Dicht.* II 30; Arens, *De Godenschildering in Ovidius' Metamorphosen* (Diss. Nijmegen 1946), p. 28.
4 *Étude sur Théocrite*, p. 72 and n. 1.
5 *Comm.*, p. 264.

(*Od.* 5. 239) and in the same verse we find ἐλάτη οὐρανομήκης. The grove, finally, 'est un peu, comme l'enclos d'Alcinoos, un jardin enchanté'. But Cahen is oversubtle, and his parallels far too mechanical. Kallimachos must at least be allowed to juxtapose singular and plural without our finding something more than *variatio* in the procedure, and to describe his tree as towering when the Erysichthon story calls for it to be significantly large. The idea of mechanical borrowing has relevance for a poet who derives his satisfaction from the process itself, but the Kallimachos of the *Hymns*, I find, seldom borrows on such a large scale, and hardly without an ulterior motive which would, in the present case, be difficult to imagine. Cahen later shows us the absurdities to which such an idea may lead, when accounting for the twelve servants who pour Erysichthon's wine: 'Est-ce d'ailleurs une coincidence que ἄφυσσον est fin de vers homérique en β 349, et qu'au v. 353 il est question de douze amphores?' [1]. It seems a little surprising that the twenty measures of barley at line 355 escaped becoming the source of Erysichthon's twenty waiters!

The idea, however, that Kallimachos is describing an enchanted wood, owing something in its broad outline to Alkinoos' and Kalypso's gardens, is more seductive. It invites us to make an emotional response to the passage, to see in it a little bit of Heaven. Of course the grove is sacrosanct; the poet could hardly withhold this fact (46). But it pays to remember that for all else we are dependent upon our own evaluation of the scene. I find it more reasonable to believe that Kallimachos is probably divorcing the grove from Fairyland, by presenting it as one section of a story in which the emphasis is on *natural* form: 'This is how it would really have happened'.

Now there is a remarkably similar set of flora planted in a real setting, and that occurs in Theokritos' famous Idyll 7, the *Harvest Home*. Cahen himself [2] has remarked: 'C'est ici comme un parfum des Thalysies'. The *Thalysia* not only features Demeter, but also fills the Coan landscape with poplars and elms (7-9, 135 f.), pears and apples (144 f.), a spring (6 f.) and holy water from a cave of the Nymphs (136 f.). Merely to include fruit-trees in the Callimachean account may be to evoke the Theocritean thought: πάντ' ὦσδεν θέρεος μάλα πίονος, ὦσδε δ' ὀπώρας (143). We may well find

[1] *Comm.*, p. 269.
[2] *Call.*, p. 565.

particular reason for the poet to use Idyll 7 in Theokritos' espousal of the Callimachean literary program (7. 45-8); although only a surer chronological knowledge than we possess would allow us to say whether Kallimachos' is acknowledging receipt of Theokritos' support, or gratefully remembering it in later years [1]. But, in either case, we should also remember that the proximity of Kos to Knidos, further the existence of the Erysichthon story on Kos, would provide additional reasons for a mental recall of Idyll 7.

The Poplar

If for the general picture of the grove results can only be tentative, it is still possible to answer with relative certainty the question involved in one particular feature. Whether the poplar is borrowed along with the rest from Theokritos or not, why should Kallimachos be interested in using this particular tree, rather than the oak of Ovid's version and the Coan congener? No question has produced more uncertainty than this. Grimal [2] seems to see in Ovid's oak a deliberate transformation, designed to substitute the mysterious for the attractive. Wilamowitz [3] also assumes a change: 'Eine Pappel ist dem Italiener nicht vornehm genug'. A correspondent, whom it would be ungracious to name when he was probably merely thinking aloud, suggested:

> 'A poplar is a soft-wood tree and consequently has not a long life; rhetorician that he is, Ovid makes Erysichthon violate a tree of ancient and acknowledged sanctity, and therefore the typical holy tree, the oak. At the same time, he might have intended to convey a gentle criticism of Kallimachos, for the poplar is Herakles' tree, as everyone knows (Verg., Ecl. vii, 61), and what would it have to do with Demeter or the Nymphs?'

Such assumptions seem based on the premise either that Kallimachos is using the original tree of the story or that his poetic fancy calls for no special defence; it is Ovid's oak which must be accounted for.

---

[1] Prof. B. A. van Groningen, *Mnem.* S. IV 12 (1959), 44 f., chooses 274-265 for the date of *Idyll* 7; F. Lasserre, *Rhein. Mus.* 102 (1959), 328 f., by inviting our acceptance of several presuppositions, would narrow the range to 275/4-270. In Part C of this study I foreshadow a later argument that H. 2 is the earliest of the 'Epiphany' Hymns and earlier than H. 4 (itself later than 276 B.C.), hardly a popular conclusion but an unavoidable one, I believe. Hs. 5 and 6 at present do not allow themselves to be dated and my own inclination to place them late in Philadelphos' reign can carry no weight in the prevailing uncertainty.

[2] *R.E.L.* 16 (1938), 153.

[3] *Hell. Dicht.* II p. 43.

This attitude has not been general, for poplars were seen to be embarrassingly rich in associations. Schrader [1] drew attention to the degree of semantic interaction between words for oak and poplar in Greek. Cook [2], from the viewpoint that felling timber in a sacred grove was a solemn religious function, compared Hesychios s.v. Αἰγειροτόμοι· ἰθαγενεῖς τινες Ἀθήνησιν. Again there were the stories in which poplar and oak were associated. Antoninus Liberalis (22 and 32) uses two which are purportedly taken from Nicander's *Heteroiumena* Bk. 1. The former tells how Poseidon, in love with a nymph Diopatra, turned her sisters into poplars while he dallied with her. She herself eventually became an oak. In the latter story *hamadryads* snatch away *Dryope* into a wood, ἀντὶ δ' ἐκείνης αἴγειρον ἀνέφηναν ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ παρὰ τὴν αἴγειρον ὕδωρ ἀνέρρηξαν. Or again, springs and poplars go so naturally together [3]. These kinds of answers all have one thing in common, an assumption that the poet had no distinctive purpose for the innovation.

The thought that the poet may have a special reason for his poplar may strike us as very depressing. It deserves to be more so than it is, for if I advance possibilities only to reject them it is because they illustrate valid approaches which at another time may be found rewarding. For example, the choice might involve the application of a Callimachean literary principle to a visual image: the oak is παχύς [4] and gives a horizontal reference, the poplar is λεπτός [5] and suggests a vertical line. Or again, it might be a question of sound. L. P. Wilkinson [6] has already for an Horatian context suggested that this factor may have a role to play in dictating the content of a poet's landscapes. It could be so here, with ἧς δέ τις αἴγειρος more phonetically affective than any expression using δρῦς.

---

1 *Reallex.*, pp. 164, 207. Cf. Cook, *C.R.* 17 (1903), 273.

2 *Zeus* II i, p. 497 n. 5.

3 E.g. *Od.* 6. 291, 9. 140 f., 17. 208; Soutar, *Nature in Greek Poetry* (1939), p. 16; Gow *ad* Theocr. 7. 8. Another possibility would be the general funereal associations of the tree (on which see C. Boetticher, *Der Baumkultus der Hellenen* 1856, Ch. 33 and Cook, *Zeus* II i, pp. 467-75) and the significant ἄλσεα Περσεφονείης, μακραί τ' αἴγειροι (*Od.* 10. 509-10). On the role of the oak in this type of folktale Cook, *Zeus* II i, pp. 677-85 is worth reading.

4 Cf. the image in Ovid *Met.* 8. 744 (*una nemus*) with *Id. Heroid.* 15. 159 f. ('quem supra ramos *expandit* aquatica lotos,/ una nemus') and the imitation in Sil. *Pun.* 5. 481-3 ('aesculus . . . instar (*aperto/ si staret campo*) nemoris').

5 Cf. τανaός, Ap. Rhod. I 1192, IV 604. τανύφλοιος (Soph. fr. 593. 2) might be also compared, but is problematical (see Spoerri, Snell's *Lex. d. frühgr. Epos s.v.* αἴγειρος).

6 *C.Q.* 36 (1942), 129.

But of two things we may be sure. Firstly, that Wilamowitz was right when he published at *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (1931) I, 185 n. 1 a view which should have made him think twice about his earlier idea that only Ovid's oak needs explanation: 'Wenn Erysichthon bei Kallimachos eine Schwarzpappel, den liebsten Baum Demeters, fällt, so will der Dichter individualisieren und fragt nicht nach dem alten Glauben'. Secondly, that the poet must have had good reason to turn his back on the well-known image in Pindar's Fourth Pythian (263 ff.), of the mighty oak felled, but still giving proof of itself, either in the fire or 'if, having left its place desolate, it resteth (as a beam) on the upright pillars of some palace, and doeth slavish service amid alien walls' [1].

It seems to have escaped notice that there is a poem in the Palatine Anthology (9. 706) which throws new light upon the poet's purposes. It is assigned to Antipater, but whether of Thessalonica (i c.B.C.) or Sidon (ii c.B.C.) is, as often [2], quite uncertain. In either case it is later than Kallimachos. We are not required to believe that it owes anything to our poet but, whether or no, it provides an illuminating commentary upon the passage under discussion.

Δένδρεον ἱερόν εἰμι· παρερχόμενος με φυλάσσευ
  πημαίνειν· ἀλγῶ, ξεῖνε, κολουομένη.
μέμνεο, παρθένιός μοι ἔπι φλόος, οὐχ ἅπερ ὠμαῖς
  ἀχράσιν· αἰγείρων τίς γένος οὐκ ἐδάη;
εἰ δὲ περιδρύψῃς με παρατραπίην περ ἐοῦσαν,
  δακρύσεις· μέλομαι καὶ ξύλον Ἠελίῳ.

Against this we must set H. 6. 37-41:

ἧς δέ τις αἴγειρος, μέγα δένδρεον αἰθέρι κῦρον,
τῷ ἔπι ταὶ νύμφαι ποτὶ τὤνδιον ἑψιόωντο·
ἃ πράτα πλαγεῖσα κακὸν μέλος ἴαχεν ἄλλαις.
ᾄσθετο Δαμάτηρ, ὅτι οἱ ξύλον ἱερὸν ἀλγεῖ,
εἶπε δὲ χωσαμένα 'τίς μοι καλὰ δένδρεα κόπτει;'

When we read Kallimachos' ἀλγεῖ [3], it is possible to imagine

---

[1] Sandys' translation.

[2] On this unhappy state of affairs see Mackail, *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology* (1906), p. 321 and now A. S. F. Gow, *The Greek Anthology* (Soc. Prom. Hell. Stud., Supp. Paper 9, 1958), pp. 18 f. H. Beckby in the Heimeran Verlag edition (1958) takes the author to be A. of Thessalonica.

[3] For a defence of this reading against ἄλγει in Pfeiffer's text see Herter, *Gnomon* 26 (1954), 75.

that this is merely the 'pathetic fallacy'. But should we go as far as to translate with Cahen 'Déméter sentit qu'on maltraitait ses bois', we have fallen into a serious error, that of closing our minds to the form in which the poet has cast his thought. The most useful translation of the Hymns will be one which does not paraphrase, for to recast is to interpret, something which, for a given passage, we may not yet be entitled to do. If the thought is kept before us in its original mould we have at least the chance to recognize that there is something about poplars which makes the idea of their 'suffering' meaningful. Antipater alludes to it. Poplars are the metamorphosed Heliades, the sisters of the unlucky Phaethon, and from their tender bark exuded 'amber', ἤλεκτρον, their constant tears. We see the whole picture in a mythological form which clarifies Kallimachos both at Eur. *Hippol.* 735 ff. ἔνθα (by the Eridanos) πορφύρεον σταλάσσουσ' | εἰς οἶδμα πατρὸς τριτάλαιναι | κόραι Φαέθοντος οἴκτῳ δακρύων τὰς ἠλεκτροφαεῖς αὐγάς [1] and Ap. Rhod. IV 603 ff. ἀμφὶ δὲ κοῦραι | Ἡλιάδες ταναῇσιν† ἀείμεναι αἰγείροισιν, | μύρονται κινυρὸν μέλεαι γόον· ἐκ δὲ φαεινὰς | ἠλέκτρου λιβάδας βλεφάρων προχέουσιν ἔραζε, | αἱ μέν τ' ἠελίῳ ψαμάθοις ἔπι τερσαίνονται.

On the basis of such pictures we can appreciate Kallimachos' distinctive method of dealing with a story which originally concerned the death of a Hamadryad. The latter appears in Ovid, is also present in a rationalized form in the Coan version; it now emerges that she was known to Kallimachos. When his poplar is struck, κακὸν μέλος ἴαχεν ἄλλαις (39). A. Gercke [2] already saw something of the significance of this apparently bold expression: 'Da singt sie, die zuerst getroffene, den anderen einen Trauergesang. Kallimachos hat hierbei in etwas eigenthümlicher Weise Baum und Nymphe identifizirt'. His idea, however, was not well received. Zielinski (I. 140 n. 9) regards it as axiomatic that the blows of the axe and the creak of the falling tree alone are intended by the tree's κακὸν μέλος. Similarly Wilamowitz [3] finds no mention of 'der Baumseele, der Dryas'; indeed he sees in line 38 the poet explicitly disassociating himself from this idea. We may now see that Kallimachos shows the characteristic Hellenistic interest in duality, things or persons that through metaphorical usage or the whim of a poet partake of two

---

[1] Cf. Dionys. Perieget. 293 δάκρυα . . . . χρυσαυγέος ἠλέκτροιο.
[2] *Rhein. Mus.* 42 (1887), 624.
[3] *Hell. Dicht.* II p. 30 n. 4.

natures at the same time. There is clear evidence in the *Hymns* that the poet was fascinated by the subject, not least through the opportunities provided by abrupt transfers from the one image to the other, to surprise, delight, above all confuse. So here Kallimachos' language is mischievously economical, for his tree is a metamorphosed spirit; he may leave us a little in the dark as to whether the poplar or the metamorphosed sister of Phaethon is uppermost in his mind.

The whole semantic area in fact is terraced with ambiguity. The 'song' of a tree reminds of the extended uses of ἀείδειν: the sound of a bow-string (*Od.* 21. 411), of wind through a tree (Mosch. Fr. 1. 8), of a stone when struck (Theocr. 7. 26). Ἰάχειν itself is used figuratively of a bow-string (*Il.* 4. 125), of a shield when struck (*Scut.* 232), of the clatter made when tripods and cauldrons fall on one another (Call. H. 4. 146). And the phrase κακὸν μέλος must be added to the uncertainty, for the adjective covers a variety of moods. We may think at an inner level of a 'dirge', but the idea of 'singing' may apply only to emotional pitch. If the dominant thought was 'abuse' or 'reproach', not directed *against* the others but reaching them, coming to their ears, we could utilize κακοὶ λόγοι of Soph. *Ant.* 259 as a parallel, also the examples of κακά as 'reproaches' provided by L-S-J. s.v. κακός B 2. We have already met in both Ovid and the Coan congener the motivating curse of the dying nymph.

I do not think for a moment that everything in H. 6 is designed to turn the composition into a superior form of Lycophronic *Alexandra*. This present play on duality may be expected to have been instantly appreciated by his audience; but for them, and more so for us, who cannot appraise with the same speed the poet's finesse, a mental readjustment would have to follow.

The association of poplar and nymph would probably require a fresh appraisal of something already taken for granted in one of two directions, or glossed over as poetic embellishment. This situation recurs again and again. It would of course not be allowed to interfere with the enjoyment of the recitation, but would be evaluated during the subsequent discussion. I mention this point here, because if any reader boggles at the rich confection which I make out of H. 6 simply because of the impossibility of even a society of antiquarians grappling with all these questions during a recitation, I have been seriously misunderstood. They will grasp

what they can, the rest will come to the accompaniment of the poet's mirth.

The phrase calling for second thoughts is ἀλέκτρινον ὕδωρ of line 28. Over it Wilamowitz [1] had waxed lyrical: 'Gehe man in den Wald und sehe sich das Wasser eines Grabens an, wenn das Sonnenlicht durch dichtes Laub darauf fällt. Dann wird man sehen, dass die Farbe fein beobachtet ist.' Sad to say, it is the ambiguity of ἀλέκτρινος that is the poet's chief concern. Sometimes we are inclined to forget that *elektron* is both amber and a natural alloy of gold and silver. Mair and Cahen, for example, translate the word here as 'amber'; the latter at least does not see that a choice is involved, for at fr. 75. 30 he translated in the same way, although there the association of *elektron* with three metals should have given him pause. Lexicographers are always sensitive to the choice, for in the earliest Greek literature it is often difficult to decide whether amber or metal is under discussion; Liddell-Scott-Jones, therefore, will say no more about ἠλέκτρινος than that it means 'I. *made of* ἤλεκτρον II. *shining like it*, ὕδωρ Call. *Cer.* 29'. No Greek of course could be expected to maintain an atmosphere of suspense whenever he met the word ἤλεκτρον and its derivatives. The image did not really depend, at least in many cases, on his making a rational choice, for behind both values was a common reference to sheen. When then Lucian [2] writes ἠλέκτρου, φασί, καί . . . ὑάλου διαφεγγέστερον we do not need to evaluate *elektron* to grasp his meaning. And I imagine that Kallimachos' audience would interpret ἀλέκτρινον precisely as Howald-Staiger do, when they translate 'schimmernd'.

But the poet is aware of the ambiguity. His audience are expected later to realize how carefully chosen and how appropriate was the word. Of course the water looks like amber, for the sensitive poplar drops its exudations into the stream. Perhaps Ovid pays respect in his treatment of the story of the Heliades (*Met.* 2. 364 ff.), when he writes: 'Inde fluunt lacrimae, stillataque sole rigescunt / de ramis electra nouis, quae *lucidus* amnis / excipit', if we think of

[1] *Op. cit.* II p. 30 n. 2.

[2] *Amor.* 24. In this case it is the following verb ἀπαστράπτει which makes the idea clear. Adjectives such as διαυγής and διαφανής do not help when they may imply radiance as well as transparency. W. J. Verdenius, *Studia Varia Carolo Guilielmo Vollgraff* (Amsterdam 1948), p. 160 n. 26, mentions the Suda's explanation of ὀρείχαλκος as διαυγὴς χαλκός (cf. H. 5. 19, 21) and ἄργυρος διαφανής at Pollux, *Onom.* 7, 98.

lucidus as proleptic here. But there is something else worthy of attention. If we find, contrary to expectation, the 'Ovidian' nymph operative behind the scenes, we may see in Kallimachos' amber a substitute for the blood that pours from the tree both in Ovid and the Coan version. We have no real right to think of so widespread a feature of folktale as a Roman preserve.

If all this is reasonable, it provides a good illustration of the degree to which the poet's presentation of the story must be interpreted, not merely taken for granted. We find this again when we look closely at one line of this section, 38.

τῷ ἔπι ταὶ νύμφαι ποτὶ τὤνδιον ἐψιόωντο.

The Time of Day

On the basis of this line it is commonly assumed that the outrage takes place at the bewitching hour of midday. We are told that here Kallimachos uses 'die Mittagsstunde als die den Göttern besonders heilige oder für ihre Epiphanie besonders geeignete Zeit' [1]. F. Altheim [2] falls into the same trap: 'Die Nymphen spielen, es ist Mittag, die gefährliche und gespenstische Stunde'. One has only to compare H. 5. 72 ff. to see that when the poet wants to make this idea clear, he makes it very clear indeed. The comparison will show that in H. 6. 38 the idea is undeveloped, the treatment decidedly off-handed. The reason is simple: Teiresias invites our pity, while Erysichthon cannot. There is no room for pathos in the Sixth Hymn. In consequence the poet has introduced a time reference *only in parenthesis*; if we are inclined to give it wider significance we must bear the full responsibility. Even if we have been tempted to take Kallimachos' composition at face value (and not look for subterranean currents of academic horseplay which automatically prevent a pathetic interpretation of the whole), we should still confess that the poet is uncooperative. For there is no word *in the surface picture* which proves that this is the hour at which the nymphs mentioned are in residence. We do not hear, in a manner which we can grasp *without* intellectual exercise, that a nymph has suffered, only that the tree is struck. Demeter does not react to the murder of a nymph, nor to the discomfiture of her companions; the goddess simply says: 'Who is cutting down my beautiful trees?'. That is to say, only the presence of the nymphs at

[1] E. Reitzenstein, *Festschrift R. Reitzenstein* (1931), p. 55.
[2] *Epochen der römischen Geschichte* II (1935), p. 131.

play *during* the outrage could guarantee that this is the midday hour, but for the superficial picture—where it must count if the poet is to be taken seriously—they are conspicuously inactive. No, the poet could have said, with as little importance for the external picture: 'Around which the nymphs used to have their tea'.

It is here to bamboozle us, for there is a deliberate contrast with H. 5. We see this again at H. 6. 41, where Demeter speaks for the first time: εἶπε δὲ χωσαμένα. At H. 5 .79 Athene makes her first remark, and it is introduced by τὸν δὲ χολωσαμένα περ ὅμως προσέφασεν Ἀθάνα. The line is capable of two tones, pity or anger, according to our judgment on the syntax, itself dependent on whether we have any idea or not as to what the poet is doing in his hymn. The discerning are invited to see that—however shallow and formal must be a Hellenist's presentation of the situation—pity strikes the required note, for Teiresias is an unwitting offender. Demeter too will show compassion, but we are not asked to pity. The reaction of the goddess at beginning (41) and end (57) of the 'compassionate' interlude is *anger*, for Erysichthon is no Teiresias.

In line 38, therefore, the midday reference is a formal parallel to the Fifth Hymn, but introduced in such a manner as to underline the contrast. The juxtaposition of tree and nymphs is also deliberate, for it waves under our noses the associated ideas—characteristic mischief—since it is not until the following lines that a pattern will emerge and show the poet's play on duality. When Prof. Rose [1] wrote the following words on Demeter's concern for a *tree*, he stood a fair chance of being right for any author but Kallimachos: 'This *defect* was perceived by Ovid, himself one of the best of story-tellers, who therefore *altered the tale* so as to make Demeter avenge the death of a Nymph killed by the felling of her tree' (my italics).

The Activity of the Nymphs

Perhaps it is possible to say more about line 38, for it is worthy of attention that what the manuscripts read is τῶ δ' ἔπι [2]. The connective was removed by Schneider as an insertion by someone who failed to recognize the relative construction. This is quite

---

[1] *Handbook of Greek Mythology*, p. 95.

[2] Actually ἐπί, easily corrected. One MS. reads ἔπι (Smiley, *C.Q.* 14 (1920), 119). At the same place Smiley shows the usual attitude to τῶ when he talks of 'τῶ (i.e. τῷ)'. It is even possible that scribes understood it in the same way, and that this is the reason why a Doric genitive happens to survive here and not, for example, at H. 6. 4.

reasonable, but that modern texts read τῷ is largely the result of Lascaris' edition. It was, to be sure, easy to feel that this was required. The stately choruses of Ovid's nymphs were conducted around the oaken maypole: *saepe sub hac Dryades festas duxere choreas* (Met. 8. 746), a text which led some to emend directly to τῷ δ' ὕπο. Under normal circumstances a tall tree becomes a focal point at midday for the shade that it provides, and Spanheim had already noted that, contrary to our own expectation, the poplar was regarded as a shade tree. And undoubtedly any belief that the midday hour had its part to play in H. 6 as well as H. 5 would help to concentrate attention on the natural. Was there not also the parallel language of Apollonios (*Arg.* 2. 479-80): μὴ ταμέειν πρέμνον δρυὸς ἥλικος, ᾗ ἔπι πουλὺν | αἰῶνα τρίβεσκε διηνεκές?

In fact the parallel illustrates the great difficulty in the use of the dative; since there was no canonical belief about the relationship of a Hamadryad to her tree, the case was ambiguous. Does the Hamadryad spend her time on the tree, like a bird ἐπὶ δένδρει (Theocr. 5. 47, 15. 121)? Is she imprisoned in the trunk? Or must she simply remain in the vicinity, with unlimited freedom of movement? Or is the tree simply a life token with no relationship to the whereabouts of the nymph at all? To us these questions may seem idle, and a Hellenistic poet, with full scope to strike out in any direction, would feel no embarrassment. But the embarrassment is ours. Apollonios' ᾗ ἔπι may be no more than a vague, and natural, 'where', but the language was not precise enough to stop W. Mannhardt [1] taking ἔπι as 'on' or 'in', with Apollonios' nymph stationed in the trunk or among the branches. This viewpoint would be easier for the ancient poet to deny than for us. We have, moreover, already seen the part played by 'the nymph in the trunk' in the Coan congener.

The uncertainty felt over this point can be clearly seen from the variety of readings, ancient and modern, at Ap. Rhod. IV 604:

Ἡλιάδες ταναῇσιν † ἀείμεναι αἰγείροισιν

(ἐφήμεναι L²SG, ὑφήμεναι Brunck and Wilamowitz (the latter drawing on Dionysios Periegetes 292 ὑφήμεναι αἰγείροισι, applied to the Celtic children as they collect the drops of amber from the poplars), ἐελμέναι 'pent in' Gerhard, *ex. gr.* ἐιγμέναι or ἀλίγκιαι Fränkel). Kallimachos himself had already emancipated the hamadryad from

[1] *Wald- und Feldkulte* II (1905), p. 9.

her oak in H. 4. 79 ff. When Helikon begins to retreat and her tree is in jeopardy, χοροῦ ἀπεπαύσατο. Nonnos [1] was to do the same later, but long before Charon of Lampsakos [2] had established a precedent when his Rhoikos plans a liaison with a Hamadryad. Kallimachos' nymph is therefore free to disport herself outside the confines of the trunk.

I have been trying to suggest two preliminary viewpoints, that if a poet wished to make a special use of this feature he would not employ the dative, secondly that his 'nymphs' are free to act as the poet sees fit, the more so as the relationship of one of them to the poplar does not enter into the question. Now if Kallimachos has found a special reason for introducing a poplar, he may nonetheless also see fit to use it in a special way. In fact the recognition that there was a minor special play might prove disarming, and make the major play the more effective. I think that we should respect the τῶ [3] of the MSS.: '*On* it the nymphs used to amuse themselves at noontide'. The Doric genitive is used because the distinctive feature of the tree is the manner in which its leaves quiver, even in the slightest breeze. Homer commented on this in a well-known simile [4] at *Od.* 7. 105-6 and also Sophokles [5]. If the Greeks worked it into their images it was because, as W. B. Stanford [6] observes, they 'loved the play of light on bright, moving surfaces'. The genitive would therefore invite us to see the poplar leaves set atremble as the nymphs dart in and out of them [7].

This discussion has been about a comparatively minor matter, but on an important issue: whether special effect can legitimately be found in a MSS. reading which has been universally rejected. It

---

[1] E.g. *Dion.* 2. 97. Cf. Süss, *R.E.* vii. 2291; also Page, *Gk. Lit. Pap.* no. 140a, 71 (c. 500 A.D.).

[2] *Ap.* Schol. Ap. Rhod. II 476-83 a (262 F. 12 Jacoby).

[3] This was already read by Ernesti, but no conclusions were drawn from it.

[4] αἱ δ' ἱστοὺς ὑφόωσι καὶ ἠλάκατα στρωφῶσιν
ἥμεναι, οἷά τε φύλλα μακεδνῆς αἰγείροιο.

Jaroslav Levý (*Isis* 52 (1961), 82) is unlikely to convince when he regards ἥμεναι as the point of reference, i.e. the way that the girls sit is compared with the posture of the leaves!

[5] Fr. 23. Cf. Jebb-Pearson *ad loc.*, also Ov. *Am.* 1. 7. 54, *Heroid.* 14. 40.

[6] *Ad Od.* 7. 105 f. Cf. his remarks on αἰθύσσειν in *Ambiguity in Greek Literature* (1939), pp. 132-6.

[7] I gather from a letter from Prof. Howald that the translation of the Howald-Staiger edition ('es spielten auf ihm die Nymphen am Mittag') intended the nymphs to play on the tree, but that he has since repented of it.

is not the only example of its kind, as we shall see when discussing line 127. Perhaps there is one thing still to add. If the poet *was* bent on renovating an image, he might solemnly claim that in this wood, so thick that an arrow could barely pass through it, only the poplar towering heaven-high would really provide a point for the sun to penetrate; hence the unexpected conduct of the nymphs! But the reader will appreciate that the commentator who tries to anticipate the fancies of a mischievous poet, particularly one who can be sophistical when he chooses, runs an unenviable risk of being hoist with his own petard.

The Folly of Erysichthon

Demeter's love for Triopas is presumably founded in legend, but it is summarily mentioned in this hymn to point the contrast with H. 5. Both Teiresias and Erysichthon are sons of favourites of a goddess, but when Demeter's attempt at reconciliation is swept aside, at a formal level our sympathy is with the humane divinity. And yet we are also conscious that Erysichthon is no villain of heroic proportions; he is presented rather—to appropriate a much overworked expression—as 'a crazy, mixed-up kid', the son of a good family who yields to an insane notion, is not prepared to lose face before his servants when challenged and finally brings shame upon his respectable parents. There is a spirit of modernization and realism abroad here, which may seem at the same time to deny us the occasion to treat Erysichthon as an inveterate sinner. He makes a mistake and comes to a tragic end; cannot part of our finer feeling be therefore salvaged?

We may first think seriously in this way at lines 31-2. In H. 5.80 f. reference is also made to the activity of a *daimon*, which perversely brought Teiresias upon his perilous journey. In tragedy such a thought is expressly pathetic, although not necessarily so in epic [1], a situation on which the poet plays as one element of mischief to continue the effect of ambiguous 79. Even though pity is there the right answer, the poet's syntactical horseplay puts true pathos out of the picture. Now in H. 6 it is the *daimon* of the House of Triopas which shows its hostility (31-32):

ἀλλ' ὄκα Τριοπίδαισιν ὁ δεξιὸς ἄχθετο δαίμων,

[1] Cf. Elisabeth Brunius-Nilsson, ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΕ: *An Inquiry into a Mode of Apostrophe in Old Greek Literature* (Uppsala 1955), pp. 122 f.

τουτάκις ἁ χείρων Ἐρυσίχθονος ἅψατο βωλά.

This hostility does not emanate from *Demeter*, as Büchner [1], perhaps inadvertently, supposes. Such an idea would entirely destroy the formal character of the poem, its pretence to be a hymn. Besides, she would have to be feminine, as at Theocr. 7. 24. The supposition of Wilamowitz [2] is equally untenable, however attractive at first sight it may seem:

> 'Das lässt sich nur so verstehen, dass der Mensch zwei Dämonen hat und deutet es zugleich. εὐδαίμων und κακοδαίμων führt auf diese Vorstellung.'

To Kallimachos Erysichthon is not a tragic subject. He is not κακοδαίμων. Although the word occurs only once in tragedy, its use in parodies of tragedy by Aristophanes shows one of the ideas with which it was associated, 'ill-starred': οἴμοι κακοδαίμων, ὡς ἀπόλωλα δείλαιος, καὶ τρὶς κακοδαίμων καὶ τετράκις καὶ πεντάκις καὶ δωδεκάκις καὶ μυριάκις· ἰοὺ ἰού· οὕτω πολυφόρῳ συγκέκραμαι δαίμονι [3]. The word could also be abusive, but the fact of the matter is that Kallimachos does not allude to a *kakos daimon* at all; and this although, according to *Iamb.* 1. 63, he was prepared to avail himself elsewhere of οὔτερος δαίμων, with Pindar's clear precedent at *Pyth.* 3. 34 f. Δαίμων δ' ἕτερος [= ὁ κακοποιός, Schol.]ές κακὸν τρέψαις ἐδαμάσσατό νιν, an idea which, one might think, was made for inclusion in the Sixth Hymn.

We have been inattentive. Kallimachos, as often, has pulled our legs gently. We expect the sequence ὁ δεξιὸς . . . . . δαίμων: ἁ χείρων, coupled with the vivid use of ἅψατο, which invites us to anticipate a malevolent subject, to conclude with an equivalent of δαίμων. Were it not for his use of a feminine article we might even expect the word itself again. But our expectations are not met; the Bad Daimon gives place to Bad Counsel. Βωλά then surprises, sending us on a literary hunt with results that have passed unnoticed. The last word is perhaps due to the influence of *Od.* 10. 46 βουλὴ δὲ κακὴ νίκησεν ἑταίρων, perhaps, as Prof. Verdenius

[1] *Humanitas Romana*, p. 206.
[2] *Hell. Dicht.*, II p. 32 n. 1.
[3] *Plut.* 850 ff. See Brunius-Nilsson, *op. cit.*, p. 95. She also cites *Eccl.* 1102, which parodies the tone of κακοδαίμων: ἆρ' οὐ κακοδαίμων εἰμί; βαρυδαίμων μὲν οὖν . . . . . καὶ δυστυχής. Βαρυδαίμων and δυσδαίμων are not uncommon in tragedy.

suggests, a more direct reference to Hes. *Op.* 266 ἡ δὲ κακὴ βουλὴ τῷ βουλεύσαντι κακίστη. It would not be altogether wrong to draw an inference from the fact that it is hard to feel any compassion for the sailors who untied the bag of Winds, certainly not wrong to withhold our pity if a reference to Hesiod is really intended, but this borrowing is itself merely the icing for Kallimachos' cake, an improvement upon his original. For the ingredients we must go to a poetic fragment preserved by Lykurgos [1] in 330 B.C., although unfortunately the source is merely given as τῶν ἀρχαίων τινὲς ποιητῶν (Trag. Adesp. 296 N²):

ὅταν γὰρ ὀργὴ δαιμόνων βλάπτῃ τινά,
τοῦτ' αὐτὸ πρῶτον, ἐξαφαιρεῖται φρενῶν
τὸν νοῦν τὸν ἐσθλόν· εἰς δὲ τὴν χείρω τρέπει
γνώμην, ἵν' εἰδῇ μηδὲν ὧν ἁμαρτάνει.

This idea itself is not new, but recurs throughout Greek literature [2]: *Quem deus uult perdere dementat prius.* Erysichthon then has lost his head, the victim of the aftermath of the hostility of a Good Daimon. We are dealing not with two Daimones, and their emotional associations, but with one [3]. In this setting there is no room for our feelings at all, except to conclude that a *Good* Daimon's hostility must have had strong provocation [4]. But when we have waded through the literary currents of this couplet, surely even that conclusion is uncalled for.

---

[1] *In Leocratem* 92.

[2] E.g. *Il.* 19. 137; especially Theogn. 402 ff.; Soph. *Ant.* 621; Trag. Adesp. 455 N². Cf. Aesch. fr. 273 Mette (*Niobe*) θεὸς μὲν αἰτίαν φύει β[ροτοῖς | ὅταν κα]κῶσαι δῶμα παμπήδη[ν θέλῃ and Fraenkel *ad* Aesch. *Ag.* 811. Some remoter parallels will be found in Opstelten, *Sophocles and Greek Pessimism,* p. 169. Prof. Verdenius called my attention to K. Deichgräber, *Der listensinnende Trug des Gottes,* NGött. Ges. 1940, reprinted 1951.

[3] As at Menander fr. 714 and Theocr. 4. 40. Gow at the latter place refers to Plat. *Phaed.* 107 D and Trag. Adesp. 17.

[4] The hostility of the Good Daimon is shown by *desertion.* This leaves Erysichthon at the mercy, not of a Bad Daimon, but of himself. Kallimachos consistently presents Erysichthon as responsible for his own actions. The choice of verb in ἅψατο (32) owes something to Aesch. *Pers.* 724 γνώμης δέ πού τις δαιμόνων ξυνήψατο and 742 ἀλλ' ὅταν σπεύδῃ τις αὐτός, ὁ θεὸς συνάπτεται. Although the thought is really the opposite of Kallimachos', Aeschylus is ringing the changes on a familiar maxim (e.g. Aesch. fr. 395 φιλεῖ δὲ τῷ κάμνοντι συσπεύδειν θεός) and Kallimachos may well have remembered this as he planned his own manipulations. The echo in Kallimachos would remind us of Xerxes' deluded conduct, not of divine 'cooperation'.

Callimachean Irony and Erysichthon the Giant

While the total picture allows one to make judgments on the pathetic content of the poem with comparative ease, it is otherwise when we try to define the limits of various motifs introduced by Kallimachos. The special brand of irony which the poet shows is apt to become entangled with his special effects. We might see it, for example, in the way in which he 'piles on the agony'. Twenty serve Erysichthon with food and a dozen with wine (69), an illustration of not only the wealth of the house, but also the severity of the culprit's affliction. The heifer which the family is fattening for Hestia (108), and which falls as victim to Erysichthon's hunger, is an unusually large offering. We normally find Hestia presented with a sow, and the two cases of the offering of a heifer that have come to my notice are rather special [1]. Again the prosperity of the house accentuates its fall. This pattern makes highly likely an idea of Prof. Pfeiffer [2], that αἱ δέκα πολλάκι δοῦλαι at 95 means 'many tens of handmaids'; the greater the flood of tears, the louder the lamentation that spreads through the household, the more we appreciate what all this meant to Triopas and wife.

Is it there also at line 35 ἀμφότερον πελέκεσσι καὶ ἀξίναισιν ὁπλίσσας? The thought clearly owes something to Il. 15. 711 ὀξέσι δὴ πελέκεσσι καὶ ἀξίνῃσι μάχοντο. Ἀξίνη later means an axe for hewing wood, but in Homer the two terms are not differentiated; both describe offensive weapons [3]. Cahen [4] suggests that Kallimachos may be having a discreet joke over the uncertainty of the terminology, but this would not really suit, since for a Hellenist both terms are appropriate in Erysichthon's situation. I should prefer to think that ἀμφότερον does not hint at an incongruity but underlines the offensive character of the weapons in the Homeric source. It gives an innuendo of hostility in depth, as if the offenders are more culpable for being armed with both than with either. Perhaps we should also go to Homer for Erysichthon's *twenty* accomplices.

---

[1] Pythokles *ap.* Plut. *Mor.* 309 B (*Parallela* 14); Coan inscr., Prott, *Leges Graecorum Sacrae* I (1896), no. 7 (pp. 27 f.). In the former it is Hestia herself who substitutes a heifer, when Metellus was about to sacrifice his daughter to make expiation to the goddess. The latter text at line 20 seems to say that, if the ox chosen for sacrifice to Zeus misbehaves, it is to be offered to Hestia instead.

[2] *Callimachus*, I p. 505.

[3] Lorimer, *Homer and the Monuments*, pp. 305 f.

[4] *Comm.*, p. 265.

While the twenty involved in Antinoos' proposed attack on Telemachos at *Od.* 4. 778 merely make a normal ship's complement, this, together with the twenty for Aigisthos' ambush of Agamemnon (*Od.* 4. 530), may have set the pattern for a nefarious scheme.

There is certainly one dominant idea which, I think, changes entirely the way in which we appraise the story, and it may account for one or more of the points that have just been mentioned. The poet refers to it in lines 33-4, but in his characteristically allusive way:

σεύατ' ἔχων θεράποντας ἐείκοσι, πάντας ἐν ἀκμᾷ,
πάντας δ' ἀνδρογίγαντας ὅλαν πόλιν ἀρκίος ἆραι, . . .

Maas, who proposed an extensive use of the obelus for the *Hymns*, would have us remove line 34. Even Pfeiffer comments: 'Hoc uno loco forma brevis acc. plur. et forma 'contracta' ἆραι ap. Call.; totus versus suspectus'. Against this idea it could be said immediately that the poet utilizes particular features of dialectal or literary language *where it suits him to do so*, as with the Doric infinitive φέρεν at H. 6. 10, and, conversely, ignores them where it suits him, as with the hybrid ἕξομες at H. 6. 125. Accusatives plural in -ᾰς and -ŏς have a distinct metrical advantage, which Theokritos does not hesitate to exploit [1] and which occur freely in other writers and in inscriptions [2]. If line 34 contains two unusual features, it is because the poet is amalgamating two literary references to underline a single idea. I have already mentioned line 115 as a parallel case, but this example is more demanding for the poet.

The components were already recognized by Spanheim. Firstly, the major image is taken from the description of Kapaneus' shield at Eur. *Phoen.* 1130 ff. σιδηρονώτοις δ' ἀσπίδος τύποις ἐπῆν | γίγας ἐπ' ὤμοις γηγενὴς ὅλην πόλιν | φέρων μοχλοῖσιν ἐξανασπάσας βάθρων. Secondly, at Aesch. *Sept.* 533 Parthenopaios is declared to be ἀνδρόπαις ἀνήρ. Rose [3] invokes the aid of Photios to show that ἀνδρόπαις bears the meaning of ἀντίπαις, that is, one no longer a boy, but not yet full-grown. Here it has inspired the compound ἀνδρογίγας. The reason for the borrowings is that both Kapaneus and Parthenopaios are giants; this is Kallimachos' manner of emphasizing 'giant' for us, just as at 115 he will emphasize Erysichthon's

---

1 See Cholmeley's edition, pp. 415, 421; Gow, *Theocritus*, I p. lxxiii n. 1.
2 Cholmeley, pp. 420 f.
3 *A Commentary on the Surviving Plays of Aeschylus* (Amsterdam 1958), II p. 205.

beggary. But why should the followers be giants? Is it because they suggest overweening braggarts, dishonourers of the gods, and Kapaneus always provided the outstanding example of such villainy ? [1] So we might think, were it not for additional evidence that Erysichthon himself was a giant.

The great Altar of Zeus at Pergamon, erected during the reign of Eumenes II (197-159 B.C.), bore on its four sides and on the stair walls of the podium 446 feet of frieze, featuring the most ambitious Gigantomachy ever attempted. The east side of the altar matched the Olympians against their opponents. It is significant that Demeter does not survive in the extant remains, but that the name of Erysichthon does survive among fragments of the inscriptions which formed part of the frieze. It is an easy conclusion that the pair may have figured in a large lacuna between the groups of Apollo and Zeus [2]. Certainly the important role of Demeter at Pergamon [3] would lead us to expect her inclusion, also the viewpoint that, for so extensive a Gigantomachy, no divinity of her standing would be likely to be omitted [4]. That there was an Erysichthon who was a giant has in consequence been widely accepted, and his name has even been given an appropriate significance: 'Der Name charakterisiert den wilden, Steine und Felsblöcke schleudernden Kämpfer' [5]. Of course this evidence is later than Kallimachos, but it should not be distrusted, for the idea of Erysichthon as giant in H. 6 throws an extraordinary amount of light upon the composition.

This identification was first made by Maximilian Mayer [6]: 'Auch Erysichthon und seine Sippschaft sind Riesen, wie wir durch Kall. h. Cer. 35 erfahren'. It has seldom been given a subsequent airing, perhaps because of the waywardness of Mayer's book, perhaps because of the undeniable fact that Erysichthon is *not* declared to be a giant in the superficial pattern, perhaps finally because there

[1] Aesch. *Sept.* 422 ff.; Soph. *Ant.* 127 ff., *O.C.* 1318 f.; Eur. *Phoen.* 1172 ff., *Suppl.* 496 ff. See Nestle, *Gr. Studien* (1948), p. 570; H. V. Canter, *C. Ph.* 32 (1937), 133 f.

[2] See W. von Massow, *JDAI* 50 (1935), 70-77; Esther V. Hansen, *The Attalids of Pergamon* (1947), p. 297; F. Vian, *La Guerre des Géants* (1952), p. 92.

[3] Sokolowski, *Lois Sacrées de l'Asie Mineure* (Paris 1955), no. 15, pp. 44 f.; Hansen, *op. cit.*, pp. 222 f., 404 f.

[4] Hansen, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

[5] Crusius, Roscher I (1884), 1384. 20 ff. It is cited with approval by Waser, *R.E.* Supplbd. III. 744.

[6] *Die Giganten und Titanen in der antiken Sage und Kunst* (Berlin 1887), p. 42. Cf. Kern, *R.E.* vi. 574.

seemed no earthly reason for describing him as such. But I suggest that this is still the poet's indirect, allusive manner of presenting the culprit as a giant and is reducible to a form of syllogism:

Erysichthon's retainers are giants.
They follow Erysichthon under duresse, for Demeter lets them go at lines 61 f. ἀναγκαίᾳ γὰρ ἕποντο / δεσποτικὰν ὑπὸ χεῖρα.
Ergo their master must be *a fortiori* a giant.

If we bear this in mind, we shall find that the image gives comic overtones to some incidents in the story and adds realism to others, so thoroughly so that I cannot believe it the product of wishful thinking. We see, for example, why Erysichthon should need 'a mighty tree reaching to the sky' (37) for the roof of his banqueting-hall; he must—to adapt Sappho fr. 111—raise high the roof, for a diner comes, 'the size of Ares, far taller than the tall'. We may also assume that Kallimachos adds a note of necessity to Demeter's aping the Homeric Eris and towering heaven-high; she must compete with Erysichthon's natural elevation. Wilamowitz [1] believed that Demeter's spectral (*gespensterhaft*) enlargement conformed to the gruesomeness of a folktale. Staehelin [2] rightly opposed this arbitrary idea with what is certainly the *natural* conclusion, that the magnification illustrates 'the enormous difference between God and Man', the stature which traditionally is manifested during theophanies. But here as often we find a traditional feature which is given new life in a special context, and new life from literary associations such as make irrelevant the dispute over whether such features are intended to make our flesh creep or inspire us with *Gottesfurcht*.

I have also no doubts that it is in consequence of this treatment that Erysichthon carries a 'great' axe (53) and is afflicted with a 'great' disease (67). Others may pad their verse with πέλεκυν μέγαν (e.g. Ap. Rhod. I. 169, II. 119), but Kallimachos will paradoxically avoid the commonplace. Cahen [3] was ready to convict the poet of a too facile use of μέγας (and also of καλός, which Cholmeley [4] regards as overworked in Theokritos too). I think that it is important to qualify such verdicts by the recognition of Kallimachos' varying moods. He realizes the metrical assistance provided by such stop-gaps, but in the Epiphany Hymns—in which at many levels, of

[1] *Hell. Dicht.*, II p. 32.
[2] *Die Religion des Kallimachos* 1934, p. 24.
[3] *Call.*, pp. 539 f.
[4] *Ad Id.* 8. 18.

form, language, tone, semantics, he sets out to revive the lifeless—he is quite capable of laughing at himself along with the 'Telchines' *et hoc genus omne.*

The idea of Erysichthon as giant considerably enriches the comic content of line 100. When Triopas talks of his son as τὸ δείλαιον βρέφος, there is a natural element of humour in the thought. *Brephos* is strictly appropriate only up to the age of four and so we should take it here, for it is quite unnecessary to follow Schneider in searching for examples of the word applied to young men. As Cahen [1], among others, saw, Erysichthon is still a baby to his father. But if we are to think of the son, not merely as a lusty and vigorous youth, but also as a giant, how much is added to the humour of this externally touching description!

Among the members of the household who weep at his decline is χὼ μαστὸς τὸν ἔπωνε (95). This noun is usually taken as a case of simple synecdoche, 'wet-nurse'. But perhaps this is not the whole story. In the first place the association of μαστός with στένειν, its logical verb in the sentence, reminds us of the part played by beating the breast in ancient lamentation [2]. In the second I would not be surprised if the poet asks us to reflect (*sit uenia uerbis*) that for the wet-nurse who must satisfy a young giant's thirst μαστός must represent a very substantial part of the whole, and so warrant special mention.

I have deferred one consequence of the image until now, for it is of some importance for the conflict between pity and ridicule in this hymn, and does not stand on its own. Triopas prays at lines 100 f. αἴθε γὰρ αὐτὸν | βλητὸν ὑπ' Ἀπόλλωνος ἐμαὶ χέρες ἐκτερέϊξαν. The thought is superficially pathetic; a premature death and the pain of burying his own son would be more desirable than Erysichthon's present protracted suffering. And mention of death at the hands of Apollo should be prompted by feelings of humanity, for the god slays 'with gentle arrows', ἀγανοῖς βελέεσσι [3]. But, I suggest, Kallimachos' Triopas is more concerned with his own suffering than with his son's. His prayer really shows as much self-interest as Medea's at Ap. Rhod. IV. 32 f. αἴθε σε πόντος, | ξεῖνε (Jason), διέρραισεν, πρὶν Κολχίδα γαῖαν ἱκέσθαι. It is Erysichthon the giant who makes all the difference, transforming a heart-rending cry

[1] *Comm.*, p. 272.
[2] See Gow *ad* Theocr. *Id.* 15. 134.
[3] Cf. *Od.* 18. 202 where Artemis provides women with μαλακὸς θάνατος.

of despair into a backbreaking prayer indeed. 'I would rather have buried a young giant [1] with my own hands than endure this mental agony', very much in the spirit of the character in Pherekrates fr. 24 Edmonds, who would rather sit on nettles than listen to bad singing. Kallimachos' Triopas would not be the first male to prefer physical to mental endurance.

Before this is dismissed out of hand by the reader, it should be remembered that the opposition of shameless Erysichthon and shamefaced parents, further the significance of the poet's shortening of the tale, already suggest that Kallimachos is really not inviting our sympathy for his characters. Even for the superficial pattern the manner in which the parents illustrate their shame by the Excuses should strike us as casting rather too bright a light upon the sombre scene. We should begin to wonder whether these parents can really be compared with Chariklo as the innocent third party, and evoke the sense of injustice and feelings of compassion which we are invited to feel on her behalf in the Fifth Hymn. If I suggest that Triopas is painfully selfcentred, this is because I think that his wife's motives are no nobler. For long I fell along with others into a trap which the poet has laid in line 80, but I think that we should fall no longer.

When the poet writes τὰν δὲ γυνὰ βαρύθυμος ἀμείβετο δακρύοισα, introducing one of the Excuses, we are naturally disposed to translate 'with heavy heart' [2]. Even if we know that the word strictly does not define emotion, but merely describes its deep-seatedness, still we take our cue from the tears that flow. But the use of the word at H. 4. 215 should invite the conclusion that Kallimachos is playing upon ambiguity, for there it describes Hera's sullen anger [3]. The goddess is βαρύθυμος because of the deep resentment that she bears Leto, destined to bear a son more glorious than her own Ares. Even here we assign meaning on the basis of the general context, for the sentence in which the word

---

[1] It should be remembered for the effect of this idea that we are not forced to whittle Erysichthon down to the size of a four-year-old giant for Triopas' prayer. If *brephos* is a kind of 'baby talk', made all the more ludicrous by Erysichthon's stature, then we are not obliged to take the wish any further back in the past than we choose. After all, Apollo slays men too with those same arrows (*Od.* 3. 280, 15. 411; cf. 11. 173, 199).

[2] So in Mair, Cahen and Howald-Staiger.

[3] νύμφα Διὸς βαρύθυμε, σὺ δ' οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλες ἄπυστος | δὴν ἔμεναι. Cf. βαρυθυμία 'sullenness' in Arist. *V.V.* 1251 a 4.

occurs is not conclusive. Now at an earlier date the word only survives at Eur. *Med.* 176: εἴ πως βαρύθυμον ὀργὰν καὶ λῆμα φρενῶν μεθείη. W. Breitenbach [1] regarded it as a *Neubildung* of Euripides; certainly the poet uses freely compound adjectives whose second element echoes the accompanying noun [2]. It would of course be useful to know whether this is true [3], for it might then suit the poet to refer to the 'primary' associations of the adjective. But in any case it may accompany more than one emotion.

This fact casts a shadow over Theocr. 1. 96, where βαρὺς θυμός occurs in a line which, for us at least, is painfully ambiguous. A glance at Gow's commentary (II pp. 21 f.) will show the uncertainty prevailing when we aks whether Aphrodite is really smiling but pretending to be angry, or whether she is forcing a smile but really furious. Gow closes his note with a useful comment on the latent ambiguity which makes a choice so difficult:

> 'It follows also that 138 must indicate belated compunction on the part of the goddess, unless indeed we suppose her βαρυθυμία to be sorrow rather than anger. The words are capable of both meanings (e.g. Call. *H.* 4. 215, 6. 81), but in view of Daphnis's attitude anger seems considerably the more probable here.' [4]

This ambiguity would allow the poet to give a new interpretation of the situation, should his audience boggle at the plaintive tone. Erysichthon's mother is no paragon of virtue either. She is nettled by her misfortune. To think that she should have to cover up for such a son, and bear the burden of the disgrace. Alas, it is her social standing that is at stake, not Erysichthon's life. We may expect Kallimachos to remind his questioners of the frequency with which βαρύς qualifies anger [5]: 'how could they possibly mistake his

[1] *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der Euripideischen Lyrik* (1934), p. 63.

[2] Of the type εὔδειπνοι δαῖτες *Med.* 200. Breitenbach, *op. cit.*, pp. 188 f., cites 25 examples of this and four examples of actual repetition, such as πόδα σὸν τυφλόπουν *Phoen.* 1549.

[3] The formation is productive already in Homer (ἀ-, μεγά-, ἐχέ-, καρτερό-, ὑπέρ-, εὔ-, γλυκύ-). Prof. Verdenius called my attention to Pind. *P.* 1. 84 θυμὸν βαρύνει, where envy at others' good fortune arouses deep resentment.

[4] Since that date G. Zuntz (*C.Q.* N.S. 10 (1960), 37-40) has helped us to understand the Theocritean passage. He discusses βαρύθυμος on p. 39 and provides a useful list of references for the two meanings of 'angry' and 'dejected'. The ambiguity of the word is also apparent in the fact that he catalogues *both* Callimachean examples under the meaning 'dejected', although Hera in H. 4 must feel smouldering anger.

It is also worth remembering how often ambiguity is at least latent in βαρυ- compounds; cf., for example, Gow *ad* Theocr. 25. 110 on βαρύφρων.

[5] E.g. βαρὺς κότος Aesch. *Supp.* 343, *Eum.* 800; βαρύκοτος Aesch. *Eum.*

meaning?'. It will be noticed that such an analysis would be sufficient to transform the violent pathos of 83 into the heaviest irony:

δειλαία φιλότεκνε, τί δ' οὐκ ἐψεύσαο, μᾶτερ;

In defence of the previous interpretations it is worth noting that there are possibly signs of Erysichthon the giant in other versions of the story. At Ovid *Met.* 8. 829 mention is made of the villain's *immensa uiscera,* a reading which has been supported by reference to 843: *altaque* (*altique,* Magnus) *uoragine uentris.* Gierig [1] compared Ov. *Ib.* 387 *uasta Polyphemi aluus* and Boeth. *Metr.* 9 *immanis Polyphemi alvus*; perhaps more usefully than he imagined in view of the Cyclops' enormous stature. Heinse, Burman, Ehwald and others prefer to read *incensa uiscera,* comparing 828 *furit ardor edendi* and 846 *flamma gulae,* also Kallimachos' αἴθων λιμός [2]. I suggest that there is now something more to be said for the former reading; the more so, if we also bear in mind that giants are traditionally hostile to the Olympians, whenever we are tempted to describe Ovid's treatment of Erysichthon at *Met.* 8. 739 f. as merely dramatic exaggeration: 'qui numina diuum/sperneret et nullos aris adoleret odores'.

Finally, Marcellus of Side, in the poem commissioned by Herodes Atticus for his Roman Triopion, writes of the ἴφθιμον Τριόπεω μένος Αἰολίδαο [3]. If we remember that in his version Triopas is the villain, it is possible to imagine that here also may be an indication of abnormal size.

Demeter's Mistake and Kallimachos' Motivation of the Plot

When Demeter realizes that the sacred grove is being violated, she is angry—just as Athene is angry at H. 5. 79. She shows the same humanity as Athene, and assumes the form of Nikippe, her own priestess in the state cult. It is customary for divinities to contrast their age with that of the characters to whom they appear. So, according to Rhianos [4], Atê ἄλλοτε μὲν γραίῃσι νεωτέρῃ, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε | ὁπλοτέρῃσι γρηῦς ἐφίσταται ἀμπλακίῃσιν. At H. H. *Dem.* 101 the goddess becomes γρηὶ παλαιγενέϊ ἐναλίγκιος before the daughters

---

780, 810; βαρύμηνις Aesch. *Agam.* 1482; βαρεῖα ὀργή Soph. *Phil.* 368; βαρὺς χόλος Eur. *Med.* 1265.

[1] Third edition, rev. J. C. Jahn, 1821.

[2] Ehwald, Bursian 80 (1894), 39.

[3] *I.G.* xiv. 1389 ii 36.

[4] Fr. 1. 19-20, *Coll. Alex.* p. 9 Powell.

of Keleos [1], whose youth is mentioned at 108. Similarly Hera appears to Jason γρηὶ . . . εἰσαμένη, Ap. Rhod. III. 72. And it is perhaps significant that 'Lactantius Placidus', in his summary of the story of Mestra, transforms her into a man *processioris aetatis*, a detail which is not in Ovid, although it is interesting to see that Wilamowitz [2] inadvertently takes it for granted in Ovid. In the latter poet also examples are not lacking [3]. Although Kallimachos does not specifically say so, we may presume that Nikippe is aged, not merely on the basis of an epiphany pattern but also from the unlikelihood that the priestess would herself be young. This is a point of some significance.

Now her words are intended to placate the offender and the verb which Kallimachos uses to express this fact is παραψύχω. It has remained under a cloud, for it occurs only here and at Theocr. 13. 54, and there in the middle voice. Gow points out that παραψυχή 'consolation', is not uncommon, but that Pollux (3. 100) actually denied that a cognate verb existed. In Theokritos it is used of the nymphs consoling Hylas after his abduction; the use of the middle may reasonably be attributed to the fact that they were responsible for his seizure. Since 'consoling' and 'pacifying' are not quite the same thing, Kallimachos' text has been questioned. The most attractive suggestion seems to me Hecker's καταψήχοισα, inviting comparison with Ap. Rhod. III. 1102 ὣς φάτο μειλιχίοισι καταψήχων ὀάροισιν. However textual questions are always complicated in this poet, because of his seeking for special effect. They become the more difficult when a verb occurs only in Theokritos and Kallimachos, and then in *Idyll.* 11, a poem suspected to have some connection with Kallimachos' Epigram 46. Moreover it does not do to attach too much significance to the distinction between the two usages; in both cases the object is emotionally overwrought, and the idea of 'cooling' has its place. Prof. Verdenius reminds me that θερμός is frequently 'hot-headed' [4], while a specific reference to the Theocritean passage would of course suggest that Demeter regards his misdemeanour as an infantile form of amusement. I think it also important that the passage should contain an indication of

---

1 Cf. Pamphos' account in his Hymn to Demeter: γραὶ εἰκασμένην, Paus. 1. 39. 1.

2 *Hell. Dicht.* II p. 44.

3 Cf. *Met.* 11. 310, where Apollo becomes an old woman to ravish Chione; also 3. 275, 6. 26.

4 See L-S-J. *s.v.* II i.

her intentions, to invite us to ask subsequently just why, in view of the realism with which Kallimachos has invested his subject, Erysichthon failed to respond to Demeter's well-intentioned words.

I have already suggested in *The Poet at Play*[1] that Nikippe's triple use of *teknon* is significant. It suggests not only the garrulous nature of the aged, but also their tendency to inflict childhood on those who have not attained their venerable years. I can only ask for the reader's indulgence if these remarks are coloured by the deep feeling of one, near his mid-thirties, who is still 'lad' to his local grocer. 'Child . . . child . . . child, apple of your parents' eye (πολύθεστε)' is not simply, I suggest, the language of one who speaks 'with motherly encouragement'[2], but the careful presentation of an idea which is sure to create a hostile reaction in Erysichthon. His servants are present and, to avoid losing face, we can expect a show of bravado. This is of course essential from the viewpoint of stagecraft, for if a spirit of realism is at all evident in Kallimachos' treatment, Demeter can in fact not be allowed to present too reasonable a case. The culprit has to die. And so he threatens her, Nemesis notes down the act of theomachy, Demeter becomes again φρικτὴ θεή (fr. 75. 6) and Erysichthon's fate is sealed.

To some my last paragraph will seem unlikely in the extreme. This is because it has been consistently unobserved that Kallimachos takes great pains over motivation in those hymns in which a narrative is involved, the way in which things really happen. We shall later see the truth of this in an analysis of the Fourth Hymn, where the reader will not be able to lodge the understandable objection that the motivation postulated is almost entirely below the surface. It is usual to think of Kallimachos as a creator of tableaux, a painter of *Kleinmalerei*; rather should we make our comparison with the stage or the motion picture, for there is reason to label a dramatic presentation of events as a more important component of the hymns than the 'lyrisme' seen in them by Cahen. I can therefore find room for the 'kindness and love', which H. Staehelin[3] sees in Demeter's words, only in the superficial pattern, and when he specifically comments on her *tact* (p. 38), no measure of agreement is possible at all.

---

[1] P. 116.
[2] Altheim, *Epochen der römischen Geschichte* II, p. 132 and n. 28.
[3] *Die Religion des Kallimachos*, p. 25.

The Punishment and Poetic Justice

Before Erysichthon is punished his servants flee. That they are allowed to do this unharmed becomes, for the surface picture, an illustration of Demeter's humanity and sense of proportion. I have already suggested that, at the same time, it helps to throw Erysichthon's stature into high relief; they are let go for they followed their lord under duresse. But it is also worthy of note that *they leave their axes in the trees.* About this and a number of parallels A. B. Cook [1] has a good deal to say in defence of his Triopas as priestly-king and warden of a Pelasgian oak-Zeus, and of a Minoan fertility cult in which the double axe is *quasi*-male, the oak *quasi*-female. This interpretation has understandably failed to weather well [2], but it is at least safe to say that we are dealing with very ancient material. Assuredly Kallimachos knew this as well, if not better, than anybody else, but it amuses him to maintain the mood of 'How it really happened'. In the Coan congener we have met the same situation. There the story is modernized by letting the retainers take their axes away; axemen know that good blades are hard to find. But our poet knows that, whatever was the reason, the axes were left sticking in the trees. He has only to place this feature in its present context to show us whimsically that, after all, it was only an indication of their haste!

Kallimachos makes Erysichthon's punishment fit the crime. He wished to build a banqueting-hall; very well, from then on he would eat and eat. No other authority mentions a *banqueting*-hall. In Hyginus [3] it is *suum domicilium* and in Diodoros [4] βασιλείων κατασκευή, both accounts making Triopas the offender, and even this measure of agreement with Kallimachos might be significant, if we only knew more about the history of the versions; that is to say, we cannot even take it for granted that in the Erysichthon version a purpose for cutting the timber was given at all. At all events, I think that Kallimachos introduces so particular a purpose here to establish a different relationship between punishment and goddess from that already used in the Fifth Hymn. There humane

---

1 *Zeus* II pp. 677-685.

2 See, for example, B. Al, *De mannelijke en de vrouwelijke godheid van de boomcultus in de Minoische godsdienst* (Diss. Amsterdam 1942), pp. 81 ff.; *Mnem.* S. III 12 (1945), 208-222.

3 *Poet. Astr.* 2. 14.

4 V. 61. 2.

Athene punishes through the eyes because this reflects her nature as Athene Oxyderkes. In H. 6 there is no punishment to be explained away by invoking a humane goddess, but it is useful to be able to present this no less violent punishment—by a goddess who must technically be equally humane (although any variety of *Gottesfurcht* is out of the question in this type of society) —as *virtually suggested by Erysichthon*. The culprit's language at 54 ᾧ ἔνι δαῖτας consequently finds a careful echo in Demeter's judgment at 63. This use of Poetic Justice we may imagine to be a refinement of the poet's, but it is not unique. I think that it occurs, for example, in the first century B.C. inscription from Smyrna [1], where those who harm the sacred fish are cursed with the fate of being eaten by fish; that the idea is not simply based on the Greek abhorrence of death at sea and an unmarked grave [2], but that the punishment fits the crime [3].

One of my reasons for mentioning this feature is that Zielinski (1. 141 f.) would give it a wider, and an unjustifiable, application. He regards it virtually as *de rigueur* that the instrument with which a sacred wood is violated will become the means of punishing the offender. So it was of course with Halirrhothios and Lykurgos [4], while at Lucan *Phars.* III. 431 Caesar's men fear, while cutting timber in a sacred grove, *in sua . . . redituras membra secures*. Hence to Zielinski (*loc. cit.*) 'Erysichthon muss im Wahnsinn dasselbe Eisen, mit dem er den heiligen Baum gefällt hat, gegen sich selber kehren, muss die *innumeri ictus* (Ov. *Met.* 8. 775) an seinem eigenen Leib empfinden bis zum letzten, der sein Leben endet'. He leans heavily on Herodotos' account of the death of Kleomenes of Sparta (6. 75), who, in an attack of madness, παραλαβὼν τὸν σίδηρον ἄρχετο ἐκ τῶν κνημέων ἐς τοὺς μηρούς, ἐκ δὲ τῶν μηρῶν ἔς τε τὰ ἰσχία καὶ τὰς λαπάρας, ἐς ὃ ἐς τὴν γαστέρα ἀπίκετο, καὶ ταύτην καταχορδεύων ἀπέθανε τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ. It was the Athenian tradition that he suffered so because he had invaded Eleusis and ravaged the *temenos* of the goddesses. 'So wird sich auch Ovid, vom Essen abgesehen, den Tod Erysichthons gedacht haben'.

However this argument fails at crucial points. Erysichthon could not mangle himself with the instrument with which the tree was

[1] *Sylloge*³, 997 = Sokolowski, *Lois Sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*, no. 17 pp. 48-50.

[2] Cf. the discussion in *R.E.G.* 68 (1955), 197.

[3] Cf. Archippos, fr. 28, Edmonds I. 802, where Melanthios, the ὀψοφάγος, is handed over to the fishes ἀντιβρωθησόμενον.

[4] See Stoll *ap.* Roscher I. 1822. 25 ff.; Rapp *ap.* Roscher II. 2194. 34 ff.

felled, the *pelekys* or *bipennis*: nor does Kleomenes do so. Zielinski is forced to use the most general of terms, 'dasselbe Eisen', which underlines a weakness in the argument. Where the motif occurs it involves the same weapon, not weapons of the same material. In the story of Erysichthon the hunger motif takes complete precedence. Of course it is interesting that the two motifs have been wedded in the Coan congener, when the sword is made the instrument of Erysichthon's punishment, but there can be no doubt that there the sword is a secondary feature.

Ovid does not in fact tell us how Erysichthon set about his autophagy. If we are forced by Zielinski's viewpoint to think about it, and conclude that the unhappy starveling would start with his extremities, this is based on logic rather than on the *modus operandi* of Kleomenes. The Coan story is mercifully as non-committal in detail as Ovid himself, except that, whereas in the latter the macabre is converted into a final refinement in an exercise on sustained oxymoron (*minuendo corpus alebat*), the Coan version shows, if not quite the spirit of the best in 'Classical economy' [1] at any rate a command of telling brevity. Erysichthon's fingers in his mouth speak more powerfully of horror than pages of detail, and recall in striking fashion the demise of Kambles, the gluttonous king of Lydia. Xanthos [2] tells us that he killed and ate his wife in his sleep and, finding her hand in his mouth the next morning, committed suicide, περιβοήτου τῆς πράξεως γενομένης.

The use of poetic justice is particularly happy. Erysichthon has been depicted as shameless; he is therefore an appropriate subject for Ravening Hunger, for both the belly and hunger promote shamelessness [3]. Erysichthon's violence will moreover match that of the βούλιμος: ὡς σοβαρὸς, ὦ Δάματερ, εἰσελήλυθεν | ὁ συκοφάντης. δῆλον ὅτι βουλιμιᾷ (Ar. *Plut.* 872 f.). But at the same time we should be conscious of the fact that his penalty will be that recognized by the ancients, particularly every historian who could not resist

---

[1] Perhaps Homer's description of the wife of the king of the Laestrygonians (*Od.* 10. 113) is the finest example: ὅσην τ' ὄρεος κορυφήν, κατὰ δ' ἔστυγον αὐτήν.

[2] *Ap.* Athen. X 415 c-d.

[3] *Od.* 5. 216 οὐ γάρ τι στυγερῇ ἐπὶ γαστέρι κύντερον ἄλλο; Archil. fr. 78. 4-5 Edmonds ἀλλά σ' εὖ γαστὴρ νόον τε καὶ φρένας παρήγαγεν | εἰς ἀναιδείην; Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* V. 10. 3 πάντων μὲν δὴ παθῶν ὑπερίσταται λιμός· οὐδὲν δ' οὕτως ἀπόλλυσιν ὡς αἰδῶς (cf. VI. 3. 3 τὴν ἀναίδειαν τοῦ λιμοῦ); Euseb. *Eccles. hist.* IX. 8.

the commonplace, as the most horrible form of death [1]. The events of the past twenty years or so make this hard to deny. If, then, there ever was a theme which evoked pathos, it was this.

Duality

At lines 66-7 the victim received his punishment:

αὐτίκα οἱ χαλεπόν τε καὶ ἄγριον ἔμβαλε λιμόν
αἴθωνα κρατερόν, μεγάλᾳ δ' ἐστρεύγετο νούσῳ.

Cahen [2] rightly commented on the effect of the piling up of adjectives, which seem of themselves to crush the offender. But there is also literary allusion, for λιμὸν αἴθωνα reminds us that Erysichthon is also nicknamed Aithon. Before the contribution made by the new Hesiodic papyrus to this question some hesitation was possible; Zielinski may serve as an example of a mind in doubt. At Z. 1. 146 n. 23 he regarded the idea as misplaced, approving Schneider's suggestion [3] that the clue was the Eion-epigram at Aeschin. *in Ctes.* 184 line 3: λιμόν τ' αἴθωνα κρατερόν τ' ἐπάγοντες Ἄρηα, 'unde in usum suum convertit Callimachus λιμὸν αἴθωνα, sed κρατερὸν abusus est'. A glance at a number of examples of αἴθων, however, suggests something different.

Il. 2. 839 = 12. 97	αἴθωνες μεγάλοι
Od. 18. 372	αἴθωνες μεγάλοι
Il. 10. 24 = 10. 178	αἴθωνος μεγάλοιο
Il. 16. 488	αἴθωνα μεγάθυμον
Eion inscr. (Aischines)	(λιμόν τ') αἴθωνα κρατερόν τ' .... Ἄρηα
Call. H. 6. 67	(λιμόν) αἴθωνα κρατερόν· μεγάλᾳ ... νούσῳ
Opp. *Cyn.* 2. 102	αἴθωνες κρατεροὶ μεγαλήτορες

I think that this handful points to a frequent use of parts of μέγας and κρατερός with αἴθων, that both Aischines' reading in the Eion inscription [4] and Kallimachos' line reflect the influence of formulaic

[1] *Od.* 12. 341 f.; Thuc. 3. 59; Diod. Sic. V. 11. 4; (Lys.) *or.* 6. 1; Dion. Hal. 6. 86. 3; Sall. *Hist.* III. 1. 2; Liv. 21. 41. 11, 27. 44. 8; Amm. Marc. XVII. 9. 4.

[2] *Call.*, p. 540.

[3] *Callimachea* I p. 380.

[4] Undoubtedly Plutarch's reading (κρυερόν, *Cim.* 7) is *better*, but Aischines' deviation is significant. I think it fair to imagine that it was *not* κρατερὸς Ἄρης *Il.* 2. 515, which dictated his choice, but the flow of αἴθωνα κρ-. From this point of view the more 'banal' (Wade-Gery, *J.H.S.* 53 (1933), 93) his

usage, the rhythm of which both authors have preserved in a different syntactical arrangement.

At Z. 2. 12 n. 3 Zielinski admits that the possibility of direct allusion on Kallimachos' part cannot be categorically denied, but compares the *Aitia* prologue, where he sees in the poet's use of the Telchines a reference to Rhodes and Apollonios. 'Dort ist die Anspielung sicher und fruchtbar; hier keins von beiden'. The argument based on the Telchines, unfortunately, has not now the power to satisfy, for Apollonios' relation to the enemies attacked in the Prologue is most obscure. And there is one positive fact which speaks for a meaningful use of αἴθων in H. 6. This word does not occur elsewhere in Kallimachos, nor in Theokritos, Apollonios of Rhodes and Aratos. It had been done to death in epic and tragedy and had clearly fallen from favour for Hellenistic hexametric verse. It is not really an objection that Lykophron uses it no fewer than seven times in the *Alexandra* [1], for this is written in iambics. Moreover it is precisely the riddling Lykophron who would still find use for the obscurity bequeathed by its wide semantic range-colour, sheen, temperament, etc. H. 6. 67 remains the only example in Hellenistic hexametric verse, and some significance must be attached to this.

I have argued elsewhere [2] that the phrase λιμὸς αἴθων had already occurred at Hes. *Op.* 363 (ὅς δ' ἐπ' ἐόντι φέρει, ὁ δ' ἀλέξεται αἴθονα (MSS. αἴθοπα; corr. Bergk) λιμόν), and have since been happy to notice that B. Marzullo [3] agrees. But, whether this idea is right or not, it is now clear that it occurred at least in the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, where it was used to explain how Erysichthon acquired his name of Aithon. Perhaps in harking back to Zielinski's opinions I have seemed to flog a dead horse, but the mere fact that 'Hesiod' had already used the phrase may not make the idea that Kallimachos is alluding to it more intelligible to some. One could only commend the viewpoint that the poet would not allude to something which

reading, the better. Incidentally, perhaps it would be too facile to save face for Aischines by suggesting that the text of the inscription was becoming illegible, but it is of some interest that Thuc. 6. 27 ff. talks of the *general* mutilation of the Herms in 415 (οἱ πλεῖστοι) and—for what it is worth—Tzetzes (Cramer *Anecd. Gr. Oxon.* IV, p. 21. 10-26) specifically mentions the three Kimon Herms in this regard.

[1] Lines 27, 109, 246, 530, 925, 1248, 1439. It occurs as a proper name at 432 (Odysseus) and 1396 (Erysichthon).

[2] *Mnem.* S. IV. 12 (1959), 198-203.

[3] *Philol.* 101 (1957), 202 n. 2.

could not serve a purpose, for there is hardly anything, in the Epiphany Hymns at least, which comes under the heading of the frivolously obscure. But there is a good reason for a mental recall of the associations of Erysichthon and αἴθων λιμός, namely the exploitation of duality once again. If Erysichthon is called Aithon because Ravening Hunger is called αἴθων, then Erysichthon-Aithon becomes Ravening Hunger Personified [1]. *Aithon* has no associations with hunger apart from the phrase itself; the connexion of Erysichthon with *Heisshunger* itself is therefore an example of that 'Thinking to the End' which characterizes the Hellenistic Age. Hence the poet may play upon the confusion happily possible through the conflation of these two images—a man beset by hunger and the disease, the one growing ever slighter, the other ever greater, until it finally absorbs him. If I am right in this, it will not matter what Kallimachos says in his detail; we will not dare to take it seriously.

The poet carefully goes out of his way to present Erysichthon's decline in a form which separates it from the norm. This is as it should be, if he is finally to disappear into the disease itself. Our present text, however, obscures the poet's play:

καὶ τούτων ἔτι μέζον ἐτάκετο, μέστ' ἐπὶ νεύροις
δειλαίῳ ῥινός τε καὶ ὀστέα μῶνον ἐλείφθη (93-4).

Νεύροις is Lobel's emendation of the MSS. νευρᾶς. *P. Oxy.* 2226 col. III (telling decisively against Desrousseaux' ἐπινέκρῳ [2]) reads a corrupt νευρ.ς, on which Pfeiffer comments: 'ρας legi nequit, ραις vel potius ροις'. Trypanis [3] regards this as impossible: 'the sinews, . . on which cling the bones on one side and the skin on the other, can hardly have been taken as the starting point of the description'. I think that this objection is answered by *Od.* 11. 219 οὐ γὰρ ἔτι σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα ἶνες ἔχουσιν. Nonetheless I must question Pfeiffer's text, nor can V. Martin [4] convince me that it is the perfect reading, the less so when his article discloses a belief that the text of Kallimachos was digammated! My objection to Pfeiffer's text is that the poet has prepared us for something *unusually* drastic (91-2)

ὡς δὲ Μίμαντι χιών, ὡς ἀελίῳ ἔνι πλαγγών,
καὶ τούτων ἔτι μέζον ἐτάκετο, . . .

[1] Cf. *PaP*, pp. 119 f.
[2] *R.E.G.* 53 (1940), 162.
[3] *J.H.S.* 74 (1954), 203.
[4] *Genava* N.S. 7 (1959), 15.

Wilamowitz [1] reproached Kallimachos for being misled by the occurrence of Mimas as a giant's name into believing that the mountain was high enough to be snow-covered. A. M. Desrousseaux [2] rightly retorted that it was precisely the absence of a permanent snowline which encouraged the poet to use it. To Homer (*Od.* 3. 172) it is 'windy Mimas'. Schneider was worried by the fact that snow melts completely, and therefore ἔτι μέζον is overdrawn; he suggested in its stead ἔτι μᾶσσον. Danielsson however pertinently compared Eur. *Hec.* 1120 f. Ἑκάβη με σὺν γυναιξὶν αἰχμαλωτίσιν ἀπώλεσ', οὐκ ἀπώλεσ' ἀλλὰ μειζόνως and the hyperbole recurs in a significant form at Theocr. 2. 106 πᾶσα μὲν ἐψύχθην χιόνος πλέον. However we define μέζον—as, for example, a reference to speed (Howald-Staiger) [3] or thoroughness—surely we must expect the hyperbole in such a setting to lead to the unexpected, something which the simple idea of skin and bone does not provide. Perhaps the reader will appreciate the viewpoint that, if there is a special play of Kallimachos' here which unfortunately has to be reconstructed, it may well prove incapable of thoroughly logical exposition. If I find a suitable answer, therefore, in mental gymnastics there will be an inevitable gap between the rational processes by which a new

[1] *Glaube d. Hellenen* I p. 94 n. 3.

[2] *R.E.G.* 53 (1940), 162 n. 1. Cf. also Vahlen, *Opusc. Acad.* II (1908), pp. 231 ff.

[3] Cahen (*Comm.*, p. 271) finds the poet's inspiration in a thought such as Eur. fr. 536 N: φεῦ, τὰ τῶν εὐδαιμονούντων ὡς τάχιστα στρέφει θεός. The idea that the poet is working up to a special play may also already involve lines 88 ff. If the text is sound (κακὰ δ' ἐξάλλετο γαστήρ)—and the odd word always enjoys a measure of respect—then we might compare *Daphnis and Chloe* 1. 17 ἐξάλλεται ἡ καρδία (the effect of love) and the choice of πηδᾶν for throbbing flesh in Herondas 4. 61. The accursed belly was delighted to work overtime. But, since we expect Erysichthon to become thinner and it is not altogether satisfactory to take γαστήρ as 'appetite', as some have done, I have ventured upon an emendation at *C.R.* N.S. 10 (1960), 102 f., namely ἐσκέλλετο. I suggested that Kallimachos (who had Aesch. *P.V.* 1024 in mind for the previous line) remembered *P.V.* 478 ff., particularly κατεσκέλλοντο 481, a rare imperfect used in a passage very appropriate to Erysichthon's situation. Κακὴ γαστήρ would then not have the normal connotation (as at Ap. Rhod. II. 233), but would suggest 'distressed, baffled, wretched' stomach and the connecting δέ in 89 would be 'for'. There may also be mischief in the proximity of ἀχάριστα to γαστήρ, recalling γαστρὶ χαρίζεσθαι (to the exx. I gave in *C.R.* should be added Theogn. 920, 1000; Maccius *A.P.* ix. 249. 4; Lucian *A.P.* ix. 367. 9; Ammianus *A.P.* ix. 573. 2; Metrodoros *ap.* Plut. *Mor.* 198 c-d.; contrast with Erysichthon's experience Kratinos fr. 317, Edmonds 1 p. 132: ἔσθιε καὶ σῇ γαστρὶ δίδου χάριν, ὄφρα σε λιμὸς / ἐχθαίρῃ). If this emendation had a chance of being right, Kallimachos would be the more likely to bring the wasting away to an unusual conclusion.

reading is expected to be defended and the irrationality by which the poet is assumed to have surprised his audience.

Otto Schneider's contribution to the text of 93 seems to have been relegated to limbo. In *Philol.* 6 (1851), 513 f. he read ἐπὶ νειρᾷ, and in his edition (1870) characteristically placed it in his text, connected it with Call. fr. 43. 14-16 and compared ἐπὶ γαστέρι in the same sense at *Od.* 7. 216, that is, *praeter ventrem.* I think that he had the right word, but the wrong construction. Those who work on Kallimachos perhaps become inured to the embarrassment sometimes caused by his use of what is to us both the unexpected and the uncommon word. It is as easy for them to be stoical, as it is for others to be sceptical, over the tenuous hold on life preserved by some of his glosses in other texts. I am afraid that νεῖρα is one of these. The full expression νείαιρα γαστήρ for the lower part of the belly occurs at *Il.* 5. 539, 616; 16. 465; 17. 519 and Arat. 206. Νείαιρα on its own as 'abdomen' is found in Hippokrates and perhaps in Pollux; Cramer *Anecd. Gr. Par.* III 23 (= Schol. *Il.* 17. 519) remarks on its use as a noun παρὰ τοῖς ὕστερον. Νεῖρα is its cognate and has been restored for the νείρει of the codices at Aesch. *Agam.* 1479, in relation to which most of the discussion devoted to the word will be found.

Fränkel extended more sympathy than did either Denniston-Page or Rose [1]. He recalled Hesychios s.v. νεῖραι· κατώταται· οἱ δὲ κοιλίας τὰ κατώτατα and s.v. νείρη· κοιλία ἐσχάτη, also the paraphrase in Schol. Lycophr. 896 (χθονὸς νειροῖς μυχοῖς) τοῖς ἐσωτάτοις .... τόποις τῆς γῆς. These texts should be weighed along with the fragment of the *Aitia* to which Schneider had already referred. Kallimachos remarks there that the garlands that he wore at banquets quickly perished, that the following day the choice foods had lost their identity; only what he heard with his ears survived. His language is significant:

ὅσσα τ' ὀδόντων
ἔνδοθι νείαιράν τ' εἰς ἀχάριστον ἔδυ,
καὶ τῶν οὐδὲν ἔμεινεν ἐς αὔριον

for, not only is this a thought *a fortiori* applicable to Erysichthon, but, if νεῖρα had a place in H. 6, we would have νείαιραν ἀχάριστον parallelled by ἀχάριστα (90), νειρ- (92). In a learned poet thoughts

[1] *A Commentary on the Surviving Plays of Aeschylus,* II p. 106.

may naturally tend to cluster together [1]; there would therefore be nothing odd in one of the two passages having suggested the other, more likely, in my opinion, *Aitia* fr. 43. 15 having suggested H. 6. 90 ff.

Apart from G—which reads ἔνι νευραὶ, 'sed ultima litera non certa', (Schneider), the final sigma is part of the tradition and should, I think, be retained. I prefer νείραις to νείρας for two reasons. Firstly, it tallies more closely with the reading of *P. Oxy.*, although I cannot follow the papyrus in its choice of stem. Secondly, it allows Hesychios' νεῖραι . . . . κοιλίας τὰ κατώτατα to be utilized. Either form, of course, would invite corruption. The image now will become significantly different, for, whereas Schneider saw Erysichthon as a walking stomach, I see him as merely a *walking appetite*, and, in fact, no better description could be found to mark the transition to Ravening Hunger itself. 'Until on the pit of his stomach only skin and bone were left' is Kallimachos' way of going one better than the average poet. His Erysichthon does not waste away to little more than an active stomach; the stomach itself has wasted away. The picture then, with the reference to the pit of the stomach, is based on the same idea as that in Plaut. *Stich.* 236: *adhaesit homini ad infimum uentrem fames.* But with the additional piece of whimsy that even the member which received the intake of food could derive no profit from it.

Now there is a parallel passage which strongly supports such an interpretation of Kallimachos, the description of *Hunger* in the Ovidian tale: *uentris erat pro uentre locus* (*Met.* 8. 805-6). Now had this snippet reached us in a corrupt form, this reading would have had to be defended at least in part by our estimate of the poet's attitude to his subject and his characteristic moods. The same is true, I think, of the interpretation which I have given above. It has been objected to me that there are no bones in the stomach; I can only reply that the mental gymnastics may suggest the spinal column: between abdominal skin and vertebrae is only a gaping hole. If the reader has followed me so far, I think that the undesirability of closer definition is reasonably obvious.

The personification of Hunger does not appear in Kallimachos' version. This in no wise establishes that the hag did not figure in the pre-Callimachean story. The Coan congener suggests otherwise, and the personification was not unknown outside the story.

[1] E.g. H. 3. 3: H. 6. 26, 38; H. 4. 283 f.: H. 6. 19 f.; fr. 228, 45 f.: H. 6. 9.

A painted representation of a female Hunger appeared in Sparta, according to Kallisthenes [1] in the temple of Apollo, alongside his throne, according to Polyainos [2] (who describes her as ὠχριῶσα, λεπτή, τὼ χεῖρε ὀπίσω δεδεμένη) in the temple of Athene Chalkioikos. It was in this latter temple that Pausanias of Sparta was starved to death [3], but it is difficult to determine whether this fact supports or damages Polyainos' location for the painting. No, Hunger does not appear in feminine form because of the duality in Erysichthon's situation. He may, when it suits the poet, be represented himself as Ravening Hunger, and the detail devoted elsewhere to the gaunt hag may be devoted to the offender himself.

The Prayer of Triopas

When Triopas prays to Poseidon at 98 ff., scholars have naturally been inclined to allow themselves to be moved; Lafaye (p. 138), for example, talks of 'les supplications pathétiques'. For the superficial situation this is undoubtedly true, but is there more in the passage than meets the eye? I think that in fact the prayer illustrates both the role of duality in this poem and Kallimachos' knowledge of the complexities of the story. Erysichthon's father challenges an unheeding Poseidon with these opening words:

ψευδοπάτωρ ἴδὲ τόνδε τεοῦ τρίτον, εἴπερ ἐγὼ μὲν
σεῦ τε καὶ Αἰολίδος Κανάκας γένος, αὐτὰρ ἐμεῖο
τοῦτο τὸ δείλαιον γένετο βρέφος·

Now it is not surprising that, on the basis of this passage, we find H. 6 cited as a testimony for the descent of Erysichthon from Triopas and the descent of Triopas from Poseidon and Kanake, daughter of Aiolos. Nothing seems more obvious, the more so as we now know that this is the family tree used in the *Catalogue*. And yet it seems to me to prove something quite different.

There are three features which seem thoroughly natural in these lines, but at the same time provide the opportunity for the poet to place a comic construction upon it after the recitation. Firstly, that Poseidon does not listen; secondly, the description of the god as ψευδοπάτωρ; thirdly, the conditional clause.

Firstly, Poseidon's inattention seems natural. One god cannot

---

1 *Ap.* Athen. X. 452 b.
2 ii. 15.
3 Thuc. I. 134; Lycurg. *in Leocr.* 132; Corn. Nep. *Paus.* v.

undo the works of another. It is true that the course of events described, for example, by Bacchylides (x [xi] 92 ff.) could ensue. There Proitos prays to Artemis to take away the frenzy from his daughters, Artemis hears him and *persuades Hera,* who inflicted the punishment, to relent. But everybody knew that Erysichthon must die, hence it was reasonable that, if Triopas is made to pray for help, the help should be withheld. But the use of οὐκ ἀίοντα also establishes a tone for the following prayer: it invites us to construe it as *pathetic,* for we know in advance that it is doomed to failure. Μάτην fulfils the same function in H. 4. 108, where the poet expressly underlines the tone in the previous lines: Ἥρη, σοὶ δ'ἔτι τῆμος ἀνηλεὲς ἦτορ ἔκειτο | οὐδὲ κατεκλάσθης τε καὶ ᾤκτισας. For a Hellenistic audience I imagine that in this case what is effective for tragedy is a definite stumbling-block. They could not be satisfied with what can lull us into acquiescence.

Secondly, 'ψευδοπάτωρ bezweifelt nicht die Vaterschaft, sondern bezeichnet Vernachlässigung der Vaterpflicht'. So Wilamowitz [1] interpreted the word, and it is likely that we will do the same if we are prepared to believe that this poet can be taken seriously. The word of reproach and the bluntness, directness of Triopas' remarks spring so naturally from his desperation that a distinct effort of the will is necessary to withhold our pity. Thirdly, the conditional clauses seem so unexceptionable when we set them beside, for example, the prayer of Polyphemos to his father, Poseidon, in *Odyssey* 9. The Cyclops has no doubts on his sonship, as 519 makes clear:

τοῦ γὰρ ἐγὼ πάϊς εἰμί, πατὴρ δ' ἐμὸς εὔχεται εἶναι.

But his prayer nonetheless contains a proviso: εἰ ἐτεόν γε σός εἰμι, πατὴρ δ' ἐμὸς εὔχεαι εἶναι. The saving-clause is a natural admission that only the god himself can verify the relationship. And again not unnaturally at 536 Poseidon hears his prayer.

I emphasize the fact that these things may be read by a person living in another age—and that includes us as well as residents of Periclean Athens—without feelings of incongruity, for Kallimachos takes pains to preserve an external naturalness. So when at 72-86 Erysichthon's mother invents her excuses, the poet, as Ardizzoni saw, is careful to mention some which involve natural circumstance (three of 'He's out of town'—debt-collecting, abroad, counting

[1] *Hell. Dicht.* II p. 33 n. 3.

sheep), some which involve misadventure (three of 'He's sick'—wounded by a boar, struck by a discus, fallen from his chariot). They are introduced, to be sure, 'mit feinem Sinn für die Komik der Situation' [1] (although the ability to appreciate the humour extracted from such a situation is not given to all of us), but still show outward respect for the spirit of how it might really have happened. The mother cannot be expected to present a bold front to every offer, the less so when the painful subject of food is so much to the fore: the marriage feast at a dynastic union, the banquet, the wedding breakfast of one of Erysichthon's cronies. We do not have to reconstruct this point for ourselves, for Kallimachos tells us about it openly before the Excuses begin: ἐράνως . . . ξυνδείπνια (72). When her self-control collapses she will cry and must cover up her emotional display with the fabrication of a calamity: A. 'Can Erysichthon come?' B. 'Oh!' (*She breaks into tears*) A. 'Is anything the matter?' B. 'Oh- er- yes, . . .' Noel Coward would have done better, but I hope that the point is clear.

The poet is particularly careful in direct speech. In H. 5 Couat drew attention to the contrast between the delicacy with which the narrator refers to Teiresias' offence and the blunt language with which his distraught mother alludes to it [2]. She is in no mood to indulge in nice verbal plays. The situation is reversed in H. 6, for there the atmosphere of release allows the narrating devotee to savour the situation, while Triopas himself must utter an appropriate prayer. For this reason I cannot believe, as Pfeiffer and Howald-Staiger do, that lines 107-110 are spoken by Triopas. Vahlen [3] seems to have been the first to speak out for 106 as the end of Triopas' prayer and we should not have turned our backs on him, for Triopas is too emotionally involved in the action to indulge in the 'Uncle Tom Cobleigh and all' sequence of 107 ff., above all in the piece of learning in 110, which on the other hand is natural for the poet and admissible for his narrator. It was bad enough when we had only to contend with a cat, τὰν ἔτρεμε θηρία μικκά, but now that the papyrus has restored the 'white tail' (μάλουρις) surely this should settle the question [4]. Much preferable to take these lines

[1] Büchner, *Humanitas Romana*, p. 207.

[2] *Poés. alex.*, p. 288.

[3] In 1888 (*Opusc. Acad.* I (1907), pp. 431 f.). Cf. SB Berlin 1896, p. 805. Cahen (*Comm.*, p. 272; Budé edtn. p. 312 n. 1) agrees.

[4] Ardizzoni, *Il Mondo Classico* 1932, p. 138 n. 1, regarded 107-110 as part of Triopas' prayer 'al quale si adeguano—esteticamente—per l'intonazione

as the consequence of Poseidon's failure to listen (97), which belongs logically at the end of the prayer.

Before we return to lines 98-100 it might be as well to suggest that this same concern for the harmony of his composition makes it unwise to imagine that Kallimachos has pulled all his proper names out of a hat. Nikippe undoubtedly owes her name to the standing of Thessalian horses, but, in opposition to Wilamowitz [1], I would put the Ormenidai (75), Polyxo (77) and Aktorion (78) on another plane. The Ormenidai are the children of Ormenos, domiciled at Ormenion; but Ormenos was the grandson of Aiolos and the latter Kanake's father. The families were therefore related, as Cahen [2] saw: 'Tout ce monde est «en famille» '. Moreover it is just worth noting that Autolykos (the husband of Mestra, according to Ovid) appears in Homer (*Il.* 10. 266 f.) as a contemporary of Amyntor, son of Ormenos. Perhaps Polyxo is a similar case. We do not know a character of mythology who fits this situation [3], but if μάτηρ 'Ακτορίωνος (78) is an oblique way of introducing Polyxo's husband Aktor, there are two Aktors with promising connexions. Deion, son of Aiolos, had a son of that name [4] who would be first cousin to Erysichthon; Peisidike, daughter of Aiolos, and Myrmidon had a son named Aktor [5] who would stand in the same relationship to the culprit. Perhaps Peisidike has the edge, as Deion was king of Phokis. For the superficial picture at least the poet may be disarmingly thorough with his stage effects.

But if at 98-100 there is superficial naturalness, there seems to me nonetheless a piece of horseplay as well. The procedure is an implicit version of what is already explicit in the opening lines of the First

semplice ed ingenua'; it was not surprising that he was able to dismiss those misgivings over αἴλουρος which we now know to have been inspired. But, in all fairness to Ardizzoni, it should be stated that the problem was never simple. While the idea that τὰν ἔτρεμε θηρία μικκά called for something more recondite than αἴλουρος proved to be correct, it was always possible that the thought was based on an epiphany motif such as Theocr. 2. 12 τᾷ χθονίᾳ θ' 'Εκάτῃ, τὰν καὶ σκύλακες τρομέοντι (which in context has considerable power. Cf. H. Schweizer, *Aberglaube und Zauberei bei Theokrit*, Diss. Basel 1937, pp. 30 ff.). But our conclusions on the apportionment of the lines would have had to remain the same.

1 *Hell. Dicht.* II p. 32 n. 5.

2 *Comm.*, p. 270.

3 She is certainly not 'Mutter des Triopas (Aktorion)', Pape-Benseler *s.v.*!

4 Apollod. *Bibl.* 1. ix. 4.

5 *Ibid.* 1. vii. 4.

Hymn. There Kallimachos pretends that he is in a quandary; Zeus is beyond doubt his required subject, but should it be the Zeus born in Crete or in Arcadia? ἐν δοιῇ μάλα θυμός, ἐπεὶ γένος ἀμφήριστον. And characteristically he supports the rarer version, finding two reasons for discounting the common Cretan tradition. Not only do we find characteristic mischief at the opening of what is best regarded as the poet's first overture for official recognition, but also a typical attitude of mind. By Hellenistic times every mythological stream had been so muddied by the traffic across its bed that an antiquarian might easily find more interest in the litter than in the currents themselves. So many a tale which is a delight in the hands of a Charles Kingsley becomes—through no fault of his own—a nightmare in the hands of a Roscher; for Kallimachos the situation must have been ten times worse and complete scepticism so very easy. If I offer, then, a solution which requires belief that a poet of this age was not blind to the disagreements in the tradition, but would in fact find them fascinating, I hope that thus far it has a chance of being right.

In H. 6 Kallimachos makes use of this attitude to his subject to motivate the action, to show us how things really happened. If this aim is at all evident it must be omnipresent, for if the poet shows one loose end his disadvantage is greater than if he had never motivated at all. From this viewpoint we, and the circle, may wonder why Kallimachos has bothered to introduce an appeal to Poseidon and accounted for its failure merely with an οὐκ ἀίοντα. Even to translate with Cahen 'Triopas . . . interpelle Poseidon qui ne veut l'entendre' is to go further than the poet actually says. Poseidon does not hear and we should ask the reason why. This is the more apparent when we remember the cordial relations of Poseidon with the House of Triopas: as father of Triopas [1], as father-in-law of Triop(a)s' daughter [2], as 'son-in-law' of Triop(a)s [3]. And then, of course, there was his interest in Triopas' granddaughter, Mestra. These, I suggest, are the sorts of things from which an age which 'thinks to the end' would draw conclusions. We, on the other hand, boggle at the infinite variety:

1 Apollod. *Bibl.* I. vii. 4.

2 *Ibidem.* This occurred through the union of Aloeus and Iphimedeia.

3 Poseidon became the lover of Iphimedeia and had by her Otos and Ephialtes. Cf. A. Plassart, *B.C.H.* 50 (1926), 406 ff., with Morel's remarks at *Herm.* 65 (1930), 222 f., and J. Schwartz, *Pseudo-Hesiodeia* (1961), pp. 336 ff.

'Mnestra . . . die doch jedenfalls bei Kallimachos nicht mit Poseidon ein Verhältnis gehabt haben kann, der dort ihr Grossvater war'. [1]

'L'auteur (Ovide) suit manifestement une autre tradition que Callimaque; car Neptune, dans l'*Hymne à Cérès*, est le grand-père d'Érysichthon; dans les *Métamorphoses* il a séduit sa fille'. [2]

'Nach Kall. Hymn. 6, 98 stammt sie (Mestra) wenigstens aus Poseidons Geschlecht, indem der Meergott als Vater des Triopas galt'. [3]

Quite apart from the question of whether we have a right to say how Kallimachos would *not* have presented the story, when he does not give us the slightest clue, can we say categorically that Poseidon's interest in Mestra in the *Catalogue* demonstrates that he is not there at the same time the father of Triopas? I doubt whether Greek gods had ever heard of the Prohibited Degrees of Marriage.

I have deliberately left to one side the question of whether a successful appeal to Poseidon was part of a Hellenistic treatment of the story, as it is in Ovid. I am inclined to think that it was, and that this would especially underline the inconsiderateness of Poseidon in Kallimachos' treatment. But in either case there are amiable connexions enough to ask why he suddenly proves so indifferent. It cannot simply be a matter of 'Classical Economy', with the poet trying to prevent the narrative from becoming sententious, nor is he shunning too great a use of pathos. Poseidon could have spoken and pointed a moral for the superficial pattern, while Kallimachos always shows himself capable of transforming pathos at an inner level.

If Poseidon does not listen I believe it is because the poet is a polymath. He knows the complexities of the story. For us, drawing upon a fragmentary tradition, Triopas is the son of Poseidon and Kanake, Lapithes and Stilbe, Helios and Rhode [4] and Abas (Phor-

---

[1] K. Büchner, *Humanitas Romana*, p. 216.

[2] Lafaye, p. 138.

[3] M. Ninck, *Die Bedeutung des Wassers im Kult und Leben der Alten* (Leipzig 1921), p. 144 n. 7.

[4] These three traditions are weighed by Diod. V. 61. 3 after the remark that 'many historians and poets have disagreed about Triopas' parentage'. The first mentioned sets of parents are in the Thessalian tradition, the third is the Rhodian counterblast which Diodoros prefers. There may be something wrong with the text at οἱ δὲ Λαπίθου τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Στίλβης τῆς Πηνειοῦ, for a number of authorities, including Diodoros (IV. 69. 1)—although incongruity is not exceptional in such an author—make Apollo-Stilbe bear Lapithes; that is, there may be a lacuna after οἱ δὲ. Bethe filled it with Φόρβαντος τοῦ (*Herm.* 24 (1891), 435), approved by Mayer, Roscher V. 1118. Certainly Phorbas plays a prominent, if confused, role in Thessalian, as well as Argive and Elean, mythology.

bas?)[1], Erysichthon the son of Triopas or of Myrmidon. For Kallimachos we must expect the complexity to have been even greater. The poet, therefore, could gravely inform his questioners that the odds against a Triopas who must take his divine origin on trust were unfavourably high. Even of the parentage of Erysichthon a mere man could not be completely certain; had not Euripides [2] already said as much, and with language which makes one conscious of φιλότεκνε at line 83?

αἰεὶ δὲ μήτηρ φιλότεκνος μᾶλλον πατρός·
ἡ μὲν γὰρ αὑτῆς οἶδεν ὄνθ' ὁ δ' οἴεται.

This latter point I have no right to inflict upon the reader as approaching certainty, but it still is worthy of attention that the name of the mother alone would make the relationship clear, and *this is precisely the one thing that he does not tell his audience.* The perfectly natural εἴπερ clause, then, is designed to remind his hearers of all these complexities. This is why the 'doubt' is carried into the third generation, so that *two* clauses of this kind will set us thinking.

What would Kallimachos say? Poseidon does not listen because Triopas, as it were, has dialled the wrong number; the god does not listen in to other peoples' conversations. Ψευδοπάτωρ, which for us is a *hapax legomenon,* suggests 'sham, wrong father' as much as 'unnatural father', hardly a propitious opening for a prayer. If they cast their minds back they will realize that ψευδοπάτωρ is an echo of H. 1. 7 πότεροι, πάτερ, ἐψεύσαντο where he has already played upon divergences in the tradition. His εἴπερ clause has been carefully chosen, for Triopas has no cause to feel confident. In short, his Triopas is the son of Lapithes . . or Helios . . or Abas . . or . . Which he would have utilized I hardly dare enquire, but, as a stab in the dark, Demeter's concern for the poplar may hint at Helios.[3]

[1] Jason (446 F 1 Jacoby) Περὶ Κνιδίας *ap.* Schol. Theocr. 17. 68/9. Wasse and Muncker emended *Abas* to *Phorbas,* for in the Argive tradition Phorbas and Triopas appear as father and son, or *vice versa.* However a Euboean connexion, which the name Abas would suggest, cannot be excluded; cf. Schol. Eur. *Or.* 932 where Triopas is the son of Phorbas and *Euboia.* Jacoby comments: 'Bei dem starken schwanken aller argivischen genealogieen und der nachrichten über Triopas wird man selbst die lockende änderung von Ἄβ. in Φορβ. nicht in den text setzen'. We can only wonder whether there was interplay between the Argive traditions on Triopas and his connexions with Knidos and its environs *via* Thessaly (it is Triopas, son of Phorbas, for example, who colonizes Rhodes, Diod. IV. 58. 7).

[2] Fr. 1015. [3] Cf. p. 74 *supra.*

Perhaps at another time Kallimachos would have recognized the Hesiodic tradition, but here, as in H. 1, he draws upon a rarer version [1]. It cannot be stressed too strongly that, if I am right in my general presupposition, a tremendous amount hung on the occasion of this occasional poetry. It was designed for an immediate reaction—in most cases unfavourable to the poet—and a subsequent solution. It is not a type of composition that 'weathers well'. Kallimachos could hardly have anticipated that these poems would still be of interest some 2200 years later. It is hard for us to savour the full effect which they were designed to make at the first impact. What is completely beyond our recall may have been hardly less recondite to his contemporaries, but nonetheless—when discussion within the circle ensued, or the poet was challenged— of considerable importance. For example, what significance are we to attach to Erysichthon's two sisters at 94? Commentators ignore the question, for we can only admit our ignorance. But it is not impossible that few of the circle could supply two names at short notice, and that when they applied themselves to the question it turned out that they really *excluded* Triopas as father of the culprit. That is, for the purposes of a good story it might be as appropriate that the son had two sisters as that he had at least 32 stewards, but it may have been another than the Triopas version which included them.

To some readers this will be the last straw, as if all one needs to do to understand Kallimachos is to sit in a centrifuge and then stand on one's head. I assure them that things are no easier at this end of the pen, for when we hear a joke we are prepared to shrug off with a laugh all sorts of *non-sequiturs* and logical incongruities, the more so if the humour is based upon them. There is a humour in Thinking to the End that does not demand that Thinking to the End be thought to the end. There is no more abject or irritating creature than the person who insists that a joke be explained to him and continually interposes areas of logic which the humour does not take into account, no more abject or irritated creature than the commentator who must explain what he believes to be Kallimachos' jokes in the intellectual climate required of academic studies.

[1] The use of two traditions in different places is generally a pointer to a special play in one of them. Cf. the rejection of Crete as the birthplace of Zeus in H. 1. 8 f. with H. 4. 272, the rejection of the casting of lots in H. 1. 60 ff. with fr. 119, the Pherecydean version of the Teiresias story in H. 5 with the Hesiodic in fr. 576, Cyrene as a Libyan nymph in H. 2. 92 with her Thessalian background in H. 3. 206-8.

I close the discussion of the opening lines of Triopas' prayer with a thought on Kallimachos' motivation. If we find natural reasons for his use of οὐκ ἀίοντα before the opening of the prayer, this should not be taken to mean that only a blunting of the pathetic tone would have ensued if the poet had placed it in its logical place. What pays respect to the mood may also serve the poet for his concealed manipulation of the plot. So it is here. To tell the discerning in advance about the failure of the appeal is to invite them to start thinking, something he could not do as long as there was uncertainty about the way that the *Heisshunger* scene was to develop; with whimsical Kallimachos there must always have been uncertainty. *We* know that Erysichthon is not to escape, for we, by a natural process which is ruinous to this kind of articulated composition, have read to the end, virtually before we have started thinking. But the poet's audience is still at line 97, and should in some measure be conscious of the possibilities of which Kallimachos could avail himself. Demeter will not deliver the victim at the Eleventh Hour, but it is not impossible that this poet may; the very fact that another version makes Triopas the offender would allow all sorts of ingenious crossthreading. Οὐκ ἀίοντα in consequence is a signpost at the crossroads, but still of such odd shape that we ask: 'Why is it made like that?'; 'If Triopas in his distress turns to his *father*, why *was* the appeal doomed to failure?'

Further Examples of Duality

The finest illustration of duality in the poem occurs at line 102 in Triopas' prayer: νῦν δὲ κακὰ βούβρωστις ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι κάθηται. Here I shall elaborate upon what I have already said in *The Poet at Play*. Each of the Epiphany Hymns contains lines that are capable of two interpretations: H. 2. 26 f., 5. 79, 6. 102. This is not a special characteristic of these three hymns, but is likely to occur wherever the superficial pattern does not tell the whole story; H. 1. 65 and, in a special way, H. 4. 9-10 seem to me similarly ambiguous. Indeed this leaves only H. 3, a poem which seems on the surface too bad to be true; if there is similar mischief here, the poet or time has hidden it all too well. At H. 6. 102 we may translate either 'But now accursed Hunger sits in his eyes' or 'But now accursed Hunger sits before my eyes'. The former interpretation was adopted by Goettling, Wilamowitz, Howald-Staiger and by Cahen at *Comm.*, p. 272. The latter appears in Meineke,

Schneider, Mair and Cahen's Budé edition. Which is intended? Here we are at the disadvantage of being trained to reject on logical grounds one of two possibilities which confront us in the interpretation of an ancient text. It is magnificent that in the present case all the comparative material favours the *wrong* analysis.

Again and again in Greek a quality is regarded as 'sitting' on a part of the body, its particular haunt. So is it with:

Fear on the cheeks (Ach. Tat. III. 7. 3)
Beauty in the eyes (*Id.* VI. 6. 3)
Anger on the liver (*Id.* VI. 19. 2)
Grief on the heart (Shepherd of Hermas, *Mand.* x. iii. 3)
Love on the vitals (Mosch. I. 17)
Forced laughter ἐπ' ἄκρων τῶν χειλέων (Aristaen. 1. 17)
Gout on the legs (Luc. *Epigr.* 47. 3)
Sleep on the eyelids (Mosch. 2. 3)
Grace in the eyes (*A.P.* 2. 336 Christodoros)
Modesty on the cheeks (*A.P.* 2. 340 Christodoros)
Persuasion in the eyes (Himerius *or.* ix. 19)
Modesty in the eyes (Quint. Smyrn. xiv. 39)
Anger on the nostrils (Theocr. 1. 18)
Grace on the hair (Alkman *P. Oxy.* 2387. 11-12; vide Comm.)
Persuasion on the lips (Alkiphron IV. 11. 7).

I have provided only one illustration of these, and then not necessarily the earliest, in order not to multiply examples unreasonably, but the motif is in fact a very common one in Greek poetry.

But this is not the only consideration which throws the first interpretation into prominence. It is also possible to take the verb *per tmesin* as ἐγκάθηται, strictly 'lies in ambush', which has a specially sinister connotation for 102. Howald-Staiger seem to have this in mind when they translate: 'Aber da *lauert* nun im Auge die grässliche Fressgier'. Ἐγκαθῆσθαι is also found associated with a quality, as at Polyb. 2. 23. 7 ἔτι περὶ Γαλατῶν ἐγκαθημένου ταῖς ψυχαῖς αὐτῶν τοῦ παλαιοῦ φόβου; Shepherd of Hermas, *Mand.* x. iii. 3 ἡ λύπη ἐγκάθηται εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ (= mournful man); Achill. Tat. V. 13 ἡ δὲ τῆς θέας ἡδονὴ διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων εἰσρέουσα τοῖς στέρνοις ἐγκάθηται. It could hence be maintained that ἐν . . . κάθηται super-

imposed the overtone of *lurking* on the normal usage. Further for the usage in general hunger does not seem to occur in an extant text of an earlier date in this form, that is, domiciled in the eyes. It would therefore be easy for *us* at least to regard this as Kallimachos' innovation, a reference to the crazed look of yearning which follows gastro-enteric and mesenteric diseases, and in a country like Greece, which nursed poverty continually, it would not be surprising if this look of craving was often seen in cases of acute starvation. Already in Homer (*Od.* 5. 394-6) the στυγερὸς δαίμων of wasting sickness is mentioned as a detail of common experience.

In Kallimachos' line βούβρωστις also supports the same interpretation, for we know of a demon of Hunger called Bubrostis, to whom honours were paid at Smyrna. We have no better authorities for the cult than Metrodoros (43 F3 Jacoby) and Eustathius (*Il.* 1363), but what they tell us is of particular interest. Βούβρωστις has always been of uncertain significance, as a glance at any commentary on *Il.* 24. 532 will reveal. I doubt whether this uncertainty has been eliminated by the most recent discussions, those of L. J. D. Richardson in *Inst. of Class. Stud. London* 8 (1961), 15-22 ('Mycenaean Βούβρωστις ?') and *Hermath.* 95 (1961), 53-63 and Addenda ('The Origin of the Prefix βου- in Comedy'; 'Further Thoughts on *Boubrostis*'). There however the reader will find the material discussed, for our present concern is only with the demon, and there is no doubt that βούβρωστις, like βουλιμία, came to mean a violent hunger. Smyrna was of mixed population, of both Ionic and Aeolic speaking stock. Eustathius talks about it as an Ionic cult; Metrodoros is not explicit (for the phrase τὸ παλαιὸν Αἰολεῖς ὄντες seems a note added by Plutarch for his own linguistic argument, rather than a remark taken from his authority) [1].

We have in consequence little real means of dating the cult, but one detail not discussed by Richardson does point to a relatively early date. The aid of Bubrostis was invoked against enemies, ἥνπερ κατηρῶντο τοῖς πολεμίοις [2]. It was a chthonic cult, for a black bull was sacrificed to him [3]. Now it is assuredly worthy of note that,

[1] Cf. L. J. D. Richardson, *Inst. of Class. Stud. London* 8 (1961), 17.

[2] Eust. παρ' ᾗ κ.τ.π.

[3] See Stengel, *Opferbräuche der Griechen*, pp. 96, 188 f. Richardson does not refer to the occurrence of βούβρωστις in *P. Oxy.* 1794. 20 (= Page, *Gk. Lit. Pap.* no. 122, pp. 498 ff.). The old lady tells of the pastures, threshing-floor and sheep that she once had, but τὰ μὲν διὰ πάντα κέδασσεν / ἦδ' ὀλοὴ

after the animal had been cut up, it was burned αὐτόδορον. Leaf once suggested that the starting point for βούβρωστις was 'ox-eater', the gadfly, which drives cattle crazy and of course affects their condition; since L. G. Pocock's note on the subject in *C. R.* 1958, 109-11 I think that it has become impossible to ignore the prevalence and destructiveness of this insect. It would of course be bordering on the ridiculous to imagine that Bubrostis at Smyrna was a fully fledged fly, and I do not follow the idea further than to point out that the gadfly alone would seem to provide an adequate reason for the offering of the skin. Could there be here a vestigial association still surviving in cultus long after Bubrostis had become an instrument for inflicting hunger on one's enemies ?

Finally if it were remotely possible to regard the very late exorcisms collected by A. Delatte in *Anecdota Atheniensia* I as representatives of a very tenacious pattern—e.g. p. 229. 24 ff. καὶ σύ, πνεῦμα πονηρὸν καὶ ἀκάθαρτον, ὅπου ἂν κάθῃ τοῦ σώματος, εἴτε ἐν κεφαλῇ, εἴτε ἐν ἐγκεφάλῳ, εἴτε ἐν μετώπῳ . . .; p. 238. 13 ff. ὁρκίζω σε, δαιμόνιον πονηρὸν καλούμενον 'Ριξιναθάσθω, τὸ καθήμενον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσι τῶν ἀνθρώπων—then, for us above all, the analysis of 102 may seem complete. But here the 'natural' interpretation must be rejected, for the poet has a purpose which requires the abnormal. One is therefore appropriate to the superficial pattern, preserving formal harmony for the story as we might expect it to be told, the other reveals the inner manipulation of the plot, for Erysichthon and Ravening Hunger have reached a complete union. Curiously enough, then, the title of the story in 'Lactantius Placidus' ' summary [1]—although a bad interpretation of the situation in Ovid *Met.* 8 which it purports to describe—has considerable point for Kallimachos: 'Mestre, Erysicthonis filia, in dissimiles figuras et *Erysicthon in Famem*'.

Zielinski (1. 140 n. 10) raised an objection which perhaps deserves an answer. Comparing *Il.* 24. 532 he emended our text to νῦν δ' ἓ κακὰ βούβρωστις ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι (vor meinen Augen) κατέσθει; the emendation itself is not successful, for Kallimachos invariably

βούβρωστις. The composition seems Hellenistic, but I suspect that there is a touch of *post hoc ergo propter hoc* in the further assumption that it shows the influence of H. 6 and the *Hecale*. Βούβρωστις seems to be 'famine' here, but it is interesting that the idea of 'scattering' adheres to its associations, both in the dissolution of the speaker's property and in her own existence as 'an uncared for wanderer'.

1 *Narrationes Fabularum* (Magnus' edition).

observes hiatus when a vowel precedes ἑ [1]. His argument, however, was that κακὰ βούβρωστις cannot be applied to Erysichthon, for Triopas could not call his son κακός (as if the word had only one connotation in any case): 'wohl unglücklich (cf. 101), nicht aber schlecht'. The answer is that the incongruity felt by Zielinski really pertains to the inner transformation, and, because of the unholy union, the epithet is really applied to Ravening Hunger itself.

'Either remove from him this dread disease', prays Triopas, 'ἠέ νιν [2] αὐτός/βόσκε λαβών' (103 f.). Kallimachos expects us to rush into his intellectual quicksand and only later to become aware of the ill-considered steps that we have taken. Is νιν the equivalent of αὐτὸν or αὐτήν, a reference to his son or to the disease from which his son may now be inseparable? We cannot be sure! This must be added to the unfortunate blunders which were not calculated to ensure Triopas a kindly reception. By accident Cahen's translation can cope with the deliberate ambiguity: 'Éloigne ce mal terrible, ou charge-toi de le nourrir'.

I have reserved until now, for purposes of comparison, the syntactical significance of lines 37-9, where we have already seen the role of duality, of poplar and nymph. |Ἧς δέ τις αἴγειρος, μέγα δένδρεον . . . τῷ ἔπι ταὶ νύμφαι . . . ἑψιόωντο, ἃ . . . ἴαχεν ἄλλαις. Surely this complicated structure is deliberate and the last line tries to involve both nymph and poplar in the action described. It is, I think, ἄλλαις that gives the show away. I do not expect that the point has ever been considered worthy of a note, for we take it for granted that the noun which we must supply is 'trees'. If we were told that logically it should be 'other poplars'—of which there is no mention—to explain the feminine form, we would probably retort with short tempers that δένδρεον (26, 37) easily allows us and the poet to assume δρυσίν as the noun. But Kallimachos knows very well that νύμφαις provides the only strict grammatical agreement from *anything that he has already said.* Of course, if the poplar is a metamorphosed nymph, then she may cry out to the other representatives of her kind. It pays to be most suspicious of Kallimachos when he requires us to interpret. 'As slippery as an eel', said M. T. Smiley [3] of the poet, and we forget this at our peril.

---

[1] Frr. 59. 20; 231. 1; 260. 18; H. 1. 13; 3. 217; 4. 13, 162.

[2] The MSS. reading is μιν, corrected by Meineke. This point does not depend on the reading.

[3] *J.H.S.* 70 (1950), 105.

The play upon duality reappears in the much discussed lines 116-7:

Δάματερ, μὴ τῆνος ἐμὶν φίλος, ὅς τοι ἀπεχθής,
εἴη μηδ' ὁμότοιχος· ἐμοὶ κακογείτονες ἐχθροί.

Now the first obstacle to understanding is mistranslation, a fate which has often overtaken this couplet. Kallimachos does *not* say 'que son *toit* ne touche le mien' (Cahen, Budé), nor 'nimmer sei mein Freund . . noch mein *Hausgenoss*' (Howald-Staiger), nor 'Demeter, nicht soll der mir Freund und *Nachbar* sein, der dir verhasst ist' (Büchner, *Hum. Rom.*, p. 207). We may, if we are inattentive, conclude that 'sharing a common dividing wall' means no more than 'under the same roof' or 'living next-door', but assuredly the poet does not say so.

Part of the material for the analysis of this passage has been given in *The Poet at Play* [1]. There I have stressed that the surface picture seems, as always, natural enough; we expect the 'pious' narrator, a devotee of Demeter, to express her abhorrence of Erysichthon's impiety. The same kind of protestation even appears in the Coan congener: 'The great and unthought-of evil which he suffered—far and away be it from here—. . . .'; 'Her (Hunger's) nose was eaten away—far and away may this be from us! —by gnawing ulcers' [2]. An example which I have not already given occurs at Pindar *P.* 1. 29, where the tale of Typhon's incarceration under Etna for his warring with the gods is followed by εἴη, Ζεῦ, τὶν εἴη ἁνδάνειν,/ὃς τοῦτ' ἐφέπεις ὄρος, κτλ. But we do not expect the devotee to make allusion to a common dividing wall—roof, yes, but not wall. This is a specific pointer to a literary text, which automatically wrings any genuine piety out of the protestation: Aesch. *Agam.* 1001 ff., especially 1004: νόσος γὰρ <ἀεὶ>/γείτων ὁμότοιχος ἐρείδει.

As Fränkel notes *ad loc.*: 'ὁμότοιχος (recalling the houses of the Plataeans, who ξυνελέγοντο διορύσσοντες τοὺς κοινοὺς τοίχους παρ' ἀλλήλους, Thuc. 2. 3, 3) not only strengthens the impression of immediately threatening proximity but also presents the idea that the obnoxious fellow near by will break down the flimsy wall of the house by pressing and thrusting and then fall upon his victim'. It is of course important for us that *Disease* is the subject, the same idea that Kallimachos has waved under our noses at the beginning

---

[1] Pp. 119 f.

[2] Dawkins, pp. 338, 339. The expression is the same in both passages: ὄξω κι ἀπομάκρυα 'πὸ δῶ.

of Erysichthon's suffering (67): Demeter smote him with Hunger μεγάλᾳ δ' ἐστρεύγετο νούσῳ [1]. The poet would invite us to conclude that Erysichthon is now absorbed by *Heisshunger, Erysichthon is now Aithon.*

Of the fear to which allusion is made there can be no real doubt. We have seen that Agathias' reference to cannibalism in mentioning Erysichthon can now be supported from the Coan story. There would be little cause for surprise in a poet's making the victim try every desperate measure before the most desperate of all, autophagy. The allusion to Aeschylus suggests, therefore, an awareness of the final dénouement of the tale; the poet takes us further than beggary at the crossroads at the inner level. The idea κακογείτονες seems to me to point in the same direction, by conveying chilling overtones. At fr. 294 Pf. = 284 a 12 Trypanis *Kerkyon* flees from Arcadia ἡμῖν δὲ κακὸς παρενάσσατο γείτων. As early as Hesiod the malevolent 'bad neighbour' makes his presence felt: *Op.* 344 πῆμα κακὸς γείτων, 348 οὐδ' ἂν βοῦς ἀπόλοιτ', εἰ μὴ γείτων κακὸς εἴη. The latter reference surely has nothing to do with a negligent neighbour (as Herakleides, cited by the Scholiast, maintains, introducing a custom of mutual responsibility at Kyme), but alludes to the operation of the Evil Eye [2].

Such sinister overtones can only be exploited if we appreciate what I take to be the proper interpretation of the last three words. It is easy to forget how ambiguous ἐμοὶ κακογείτονες ἐχθροί really is, and in my earlier study I failed to make the point as clear as possible. Cahen [3] saw two possibilities: if the thought is to be connected with the goddess, then 'mauvais voisins pour moi, que tes ennemis'—and so he takes it in his Budé text; if it applies to the narrator, 'mauvais voisins me sont des ennemis'. Both of these interpretations are of course in the spirit of the superficial tale, but there is a third which shows the poet's irony, namely by taking 'ἐχθροί, rather than κακογείτονες, as predicate: 'I can't bear Bad

[1] Cf. Antiphanes fr. 276 Edmonds A. ἓν νόσημα τοῦτ' ἔχει· | ἀεὶ γὰρ ὀξύπεινός ἐστι. B. Θετταλὸν | λέγεις κομιδῇ τὸν ἄνδρα.

[2] Cf. Alkiphron I. 18. 1 (and Kock *C.A.F.* iii p. 440) Δυσμενὴς καὶ βάσκανος ὁ τῶν γειτόνων ὀφθαλμός, φησὶν ἡ παροιμία; Verg. *Ecl.* 3. 103; XII Tab. 8 (and C. Pharr, *T.A.P.A.* 63 (1932), 277 f.); J. Geffcken, *Charisteria Alois Rzach* (1930), pp. 36-40; S. Seligmann, *Die Zauberkraft des Auges und das Berufen* I (Hamburg 1922), pp. 350 f., 356, 379 ff. At p. 95 Seligmann cites the Modern Greek proverb ἐχθρὸ καὶ φθονερὸ τὸ μάτι τῶν γειτόνων.

[3] *Comm.*, p. 117.

Neighbours'. Howald-Staiger had already expressed this possibility by their 'Ich hasse die schändlichen Nachbarn' and one reviewer at least took them to task for it. Unfortunately in this kind of poetry it is possible to be erroneously right, for what is appropriate only to the inner plan will jar if it is built into the external picture. The translator's lot is not a happy one: he must either play the game straight, with an abundance of explanatory footnotes, or else cast caution and the superficial pattern to the winds by painting the text in the lurid colours of a Callimachean post-mortem. A compromise seems out of the question.

The End of the Story

We have already had to face the question of whether Kallimachos' story is complete, but it deserves to be examined in more detail. Cahen's remarks in his Budé edition may serve as an introduction:

> 'L'histoire d'Érysichthon n'est pas amenée jusqu'à sa fin naturelle, la mort du malheureux — étant donné d'ailleurs que Callimaque ne dit rien ici d'une tradition qui complique la légende en faisant intervenir Mestra, la fille d'Érysichthon. Le récit est interrompu par l'arrivée du calathos; l'ensemble de la pièce en prend un caractère plus réaliste. L'effet littéraire est ici encore au premier plan.'

We see then that the question really has two parts: why is the Mestra episode suppressed, and why is the tale not taken to its natural conclusion ? In the first place, Kallimachos assuredly does not leave Mestra out of the picture because he does not know of her: 'der die Tochter nicht kennt, auch der Name Aithon fremd ist' [1]. And yet this line of argument seems to have a fatal fascination. Wilamowitz [2] uses it when comparing the versions of Marcellus of Side and Kallimachos: 'Er kennt selbst den Demeterhymnus nicht, obwohl er vom Triopion bei Knidos erzählt'; Zielinski (I. 140) uses it again: 'Von einer Sendung an Fames weiss Kallimachos nicht: die Göttin straft den Frevler unmittelbar'. Kern [3] was even prepared to argue that the absence of Mestra in Kallimachos' account shows that he is 'obviously preserving the purest form of the Erysichthon story'. Perhaps we all fall victim to this form of ingenuousness at some time or other, but in more sober moments it should be recognized that an ancient author is

[1] Zielinski I. 146 n. 23.
[2] *Marcellus von Side*, SB Berlin 1928, p. 16.
[3] *R.E.* vi (1907), 572. 58.

likely to edit his material with no concern at all for our thirst for *Quellenforschung*.

But if Kallimachos knows the Mestra episode—and I think that his use of Aithon, and now the evidence of Hesiod and the Coan congener establish this—we must not place too noble a construction upon its absence from the main outline of his story, such as Cahen [1] does:

> 'Il supprime l'histoire de Mestra; s'il avait été curieux d'extraordinaire, surtout, comme l'affirme A. Croiset, de «métamorphoses», il avait là pourtant une belle occasion d'écouter son penchant! . . . par un retranchement radical il simplifie la légende et la ramène à ce qui est essentiel pour l'effet littéraire et le dessein religieux. *C'est un procédé d'une sobriété qu'on serait tenté de dire classique.*' (My italics).

Now Kallimachos may be interested in instances of duality, of metamorphosis, and still not seize with open arms the opportunity to ruin his composition. He could not in any case tell the story of Mestra for its own sake, for his composition has a plan. If it were admissible to include her, she would still have been an embarrassment, prolonging the action, postponing the inevitable result and *making it impossible to introduce an earlier ending*. No, he cannot introduce Mestra for two very good reasons. Firstly, he has turned Erysichthon into a juvenile delinquent, too young to have a marriageable daughter. Secondly, the shame of the household is complete when Erysichthon's affliction is exposed to public gaze; his parents can feel no worse over his subsequent sufferings.

At the same time there must be, at the superficial level, a natural reason for the failure to continue. It should not be found in the answer given by J. Schwartz [2]: 'Callimaque avait intérêt à taire l'histoire de Mestra, pour la plus grande gloire de Déméter'. Such an approach takes Kallimachos far too seriously and is more at home in the elaborate and outdated reconstruction that we find in Lafaye [3]: a hymn in Demeter's honour commissioned by Philadelphos, a story chosen to suit a festival of the Cnidian Triopion, to be sung at the departure of the procession, and, needless to say, the poet 'met au premier plan et en pleine lumière la figure auguste de Cérès, la légende d'Érysichthon n'étant destinée qu'à exalter la grandeur et la puissance de la déesse'. I doubt whether any today would agree with Immisch [4], that the poet's model had a happy

---

[1] *Call.*, p. 366.
[2] *Pseudo-Hesiodeia*, p. 278.
[3] Pp. 134 f.
[4] *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1913, pp. 678 f.

ending which he could not use, or even with Deubner [1], that the poet's interest in the story ceased with the detailed description of insatiable hunger. Rather must we conclude that the arrival of the *kalathos*-procession has interrupted the narrative, for, as Wilamowitz [2] remarked, it would be a little too convenient if the procession waited until the narrator had had her say. We are therefore encouraged to believe that Kallimachos, like his story, has more to offer, but that the procession which he has recreated before our mind's eye must once again take control of the composition. 'L'effet d'émotion que le poète tire de son récit est interrompu par l'effet *plus fort* de l'apparition divine' [3].

Error creeps in when this development is explained as the poet's principal purpose, the presupposition of Cahen [4] and Howald [5]. The latter believes that Kallimachos faced a difficult problem, for he had to make a suitable transition to the passionately excited spirit of the ritual framework. That had become very exacting through the degeneration of the Erysichthon story into a 'lustiges Kindermärchen'. So the narrator's prayer, 'mit einer emphatischen Ichbetonung', is designed to elevate the personal tone and provide an emotional bridge connecting with the tense atmosphere of the moment of arrival of the *kalathos*. Howald himself admits that his Kallimachos is not altogether successful. Büchner also believes that 'Kallimachos steers back into the hymn with the prayer' [6]. Finally, Erbse [7] had a different approach. His Kallimachos employs both ritual frame and narrative to present to us the abstraction of deity. The epiphany at the close of the hymn is that of the divinity whom the poet has made real, indeed alive, to us; by line 117 we have material enough to appreciate what Demeter meant to a devotee.

Wilamowitz however realized that, while the story may give an impression of having been interrupted, it is in fact not so. 'Sie ist nicht vollendet, aber wir vermissen nichts in diesem Munde' [8].

---

1 *N. Jbb.* 1921, pp. 374 f.

2 *Reden und Vorträge*[3] (1913), p. 286 n. 1; cf. (A. Körte-) P. Händel, *Die hellenistische Dichtung*[2] (1960), pp. 52 f.

3 Cahen, *Call.*, p. 400.

4 *Comm.*, p. 273.

5 *Der Dichter Kallimachos von Kyrene*, pp. 59 ff.

6 *Humanitas Romana*, p. 207.

7 *Herm.* 83 (1955), 411-428.

8 *Hell. Dicht.* II p. 33. n. 6.

But at the same time the speaker is not simply a female devotee who will act upon the belief that the hearers have no interest in Erysichthon's death or in Triopas' wandering from Pelasgiotis to Knidos [1]; Kallimachos delivers his composition to the literary circle, and responsibility for any cropping of the story must ultimately be his. It is not sufficient to say that his characters would not be interested, for the suppressed incidents could, without great effort, be made to provide further evidence of the goddess' power.

When Kallimachos wrote line 24, the opening line of the tale, he knew that he was to have no later opportunity to introduce the element of *aition*, and οὔπω, like ὅθεν, is often an aitiological signpost in Hellenistic literature. He could not carry the story through to the foundation of the Triopion in expiation for Erysichthon's offence, but he was too much of a Hellenist to let the fact pass entirely without notice. At the end of the tale, lines 116-7, we also have evidence of careful craftsmanship. Kallimachos' tale is complete when the Skeleton in the Cupboard is disclosed, when Erysichthon becomes Aithon. But we are free also to conclude that his narrator is well aware of the ultimate end of the culprit. Characters of dramatic mime gain much of their charm for the reader, and their merits as material for the artist, from their stuffiness. When the speaker reaches the logical point to speak of Erysichthon's last desperate expedients she finds the subject so grisly and antisocial that, undoubtedly with a shudder, she introduces a protestation of her own piety instead. At this level it is with a feeling of relief that she would welcome the arrival of the *kalathos*; the girls should by now have got the message of her sermon on the perils of overeating.

If I am right, the combination of literary reference in ὁμότοιχος and sinister overtones in κακογείτονες—Heaven forbid that she should live next to a monster like that!—make a proper emotional response to the superficial pattern of the story impossible. And perhaps this provides the best moment to honour a promise [2] that I would discuss the second *sophisma*, or emotional 'safety-valve', employed by Kallimachos in Hymn 6. At lines 118 ff. the emotional content is recharged, and the poet must use his device again [3].

[1] Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* II p. 33.
[2] *PaP*, p. 52.
[3] Cf. *PaP*, pp. 49 ff.

The Sophisma of 126-7

Kallimachos introduces a short *credo* of the devotees in three articles. As the *kalathos* is borne by four fair horses, so shall the goddess bring them four fair seasons for the coming year. As they tramp through the streets bare-footed and bare-headed, so shall they always have feet and heads kept free from harm. The naiveté and the confidence ring true, so true that, to avoid objection, both good-humoured and otherwise, that he has let his emotions run away with him, Kallimachos must, I believe, stamp the passage indelibly with his irony. This occurs in the last article of faith:

ὡς δ' αἱ λικνοφόροι χρυσῶ πλέα λίκνα φέροντι,
ὣς ἁμὲς τὸν χρυσὸν ἀφειδέα πασσαίμεσθα (126-7).

I have shown above the manuscript reading πασσαίμεσθα, although it has gone entirely out of fashion; so much so, that the *apparatus criticus* of Cahen (Budé), Mair(Loeb) and Wilamowitz does not acknowledge its existence. It is the aorist optative of πατέομαι with doubled sigma: 'may we eat'. The idea of eating gold sounded of course so incredible[1] that Ernesti changed it to πασαίμεσθα (from πάομαι 'I get') and Meineke, on the basis of the scholion κτησόμεθα, to πασεύμεσθα, the Doric future of the same verb. Pfeiffer and Howald-Staiger have now followed Meineke, for a new scholion paraphrases the thought with a simple future: ἕξομεν (*P. Oxy.* 2258 fr. 9(a)). But there is something which should give us pause, the fact that another part of the couplet has raised misgivings.

What is meant by the statement that the *likna* are χρυσῶ πλέα ? The scholion already gave a choice: 'either filled with gold or gilded'; it is clear that there was no ready way available for deciding the question. Spanheim prefers the latter idea: *auro plena* = *aurea*; Schneider [2] argues for 'canistra plena vasorum aureorum'. At the present day the phrase is commonly translated literally, and it is only an expert in the field like Prof. Nilsson [3] who still voices uneasiness: 'It is a little surprising that the likna are said to be full of gold'. It is of course impossible to deny its feasibility

[1] Moreover the aoristic forms of πάομαι often appear with an unjustified double sigma in MSS. (*e.g.* at Theogn. 146).

[2] *Callimachea* I (1870), p. 398. He is supported, for example, by Reinecke, *De Schol. Call.* (1887), p. 19.

[3] *Dionysiac Mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman Age* (1957), p. 30.

categorically, for Philadelphos' great Dionysiac procession at Alexandria—described by Athenaios (V. 198-203) from Kallixeinos' account—featured a vast amount of gold, and in a large number of connexions. We hear there of 'women carrying the *likna*' (198e), but *likna* filled with gold instead of corn appear only in Kallimachos. It is beyond reasonable doubt that such *likna* for a procession at this time and in this country would be made of gold [1], but this is not what the poet says.

I think that there is a special reason. When Athenaios (V. 203 c) writes of the wealth of gold used in the Dionysiac procession, he remarks: 'What monarchy has ever been so rich in gold (as the Ptolemaic)? It is only the Nile, the river properly called "gold-flowing" (χρυσορόας), that with its boundless crops of food actually washes down *unadulterated gold which is harvested* (γεωργούμενον) with no risk, so that it can supply all men sufficiently'. Gulick *ad loc.* rightly comments: 'The meaning is that the fertilizing waters of the Nile are the cause of crops which equal gold in value'. Here we have two significant things bound together: the Nile as χρυσορόας and an explanation of the epithet.

Gulick [2] maintained that Athenaios' remark was no proof that the Nile was in fact called *chrysorhoas*; 'Athenaeus merely says that it *should have been* so called'. But if we compare this author's use of ὡς ἀληθῶς with that at Luc. *Jupp. trag.* 8, for example, a different conclusion will be drawn. There Lucian refers to a group of gods ὅλοι ὁλόχρυσοι καὶ βαρεῖς καὶ πολυτίμητοι ὡς ἀληθῶς. Now πολυτίμητος was a *common* epithet for divinities in prayers [3]. At *R.E.* iii. 2519 f. Sethe lists *thirteen* rivers called *Chrysor(r)hoas*, which is surely suggestive. Now Kaibel drew attention to Greg. Naz. *or.* 21 (Migne, P. Gr. 35, 1116) ποιητοῦ δὲ ἦν ἄρα καὶ τὸν Νεῖλον εἰπεῖν, τὸν χρυσορρόαν ὄντως καὶ εὔσταχυν. R. Keydell [4] also made a contribution to the question by citing Migne, P. Gr. 36, 340 as evidence that Gregory Nazianzen knew poems on the Nile (and Kaibel had already suggested that Athenaios' remark is based on a poetic model), also

---

[1] Cahen, *Comm.*, p. 276, pertinently compares Schol. Ar. *Ach.* 242, where in honour of Dionysos at Athens baskets made of gold were carried. Cf. *Comm.*, p. 275; Wilamowitz, *Hell. Dicht.* II p. 27. In the scholion referred to the scribe adds what we expect: τὰ κανᾶ, ἐφ' ὧν τὰς ἀπαρχὰς ἁπάντων ἐτίθεσαν.

[2] Loeb edition of Athenaios, II (1928), p. 419 n.

[3] Kleinknecht, *Gebetsparodie*, pp. 23 n. 3, 49, 72; G. Meyer, Philol. Supplbd. xvi, 3 (1923), pp. 76 f.; K. Keyssner, *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus* (1932), pp. 55 ff., 65 ff.

[4] *Herm.* 69 (1934), 423 f.

by reference to a late amulet which seems to involve the same association of ideas: ομβροροχρυσουνται = ὄμβρῳ χρυσοῦνται or ὄμβρῳ χρυσοροοῦνται (sc. ἄρουραι). Sethe had no better material to add for the Nile as *Chrysorhoas* than Ioann. Lyd. *De mens.* iv. 107 (p. 144 Wünsch)—where the river is declared successively to have borne the names of Ilas, Aigyptos, Chrysorrhoas and finally Neilos—and Ioann. Antioch. fr. 2, 17 (*FHG* IV 541 Müller). He also mentioned: 'Auch einer der Stromarme des Nils oder ein Canal im Delta hiess χρυσορρόας, koptisch *Pawon-n-nub p-herman*'. But thus far Athenaios represents our earliest evidence.

It is possible now, however, to throw it further back, for the Nile appears as χρυσορόας at *Supp. Epigr.* 8. 549. 17:

> Νεῖλον χρυσορ{ρ}όαν πείθουσ' ἀνάγεις κατὰ [ὥρας]
> Αἰγύπτου ἐπὶ γῆν ἀνδράσιν εὐτερπίην.
> εὐανθεῖ τότε κάρπος ἅπας καὶ πᾶσι μερίζ[εις],
> οἷσι θέλεις, ζωὴν παντοδαπῶν ἀγαθῶν.

This is part of the second of four hymns in honour of Isis-Hermuthis which were engraved at Medīnet Mādī in the Fayyum by an Isidoros who is generally dated in the first century B.C. Prof. M. Rostovtzeff [1] wrote of this poetaster: 'Isidore parle plusieurs fois de la fertilité de l'Égypte. Il n'invente rien; il répète des lieux communs, des expressions stéréotypées.' If there is any truth in this remark, we should bear it in mind when considering the antiquity of *chrysorhoas*.

From a papyrus of the first century A.D., in an epigram honouring Augustus (and therefore presumably contemporary with the events), comes an equation of corn and gold *in connexion with the Nile* [2].

> δωροφόροις δὲ χέρεσσιν ἐδέξατο Νεῖλος ἄνακτα
> καὶ δάμαρ (Egypt) ἡ χρυσέοις πήχεσι λουομένη.

Page appropriately comments that the arms are 'the floods which the Nile puts forth to embrace the land', and that they are golden 'because of the cornfields and other bright harvests which arise'; although the pattern which is now emerging should place the emphasis, not on brightness, but on worth. It would be reasonable, I think, to put all these pieces of information together and conclude that the description of rich harvests of corn as gold was a literary

[1] *Mélanges Radet* (= *R.E.A.* 42 (1940)), p. 513.
[2] Page, *Gk. Lit. Pap.*, p. 470 lines 9-10.

topos, but with special reference as an explanation of the Nile as *chrysorhoas*.

The word was available as early as Euripides, who at *Bacch.* 154 applies it to Mt. Tmolos, the source of Paktolos, famous for its alluvial gold; the fact that the usage is indirect—for we should resist attempts to read Paktolos itself in the text—suggests that the poet is renovating an earlier idea, rather than inventing the compound. Its next occurrence also shows renovation, for Hedylos [1] alludes by mention of Ζεὺς χρυσορόης to the shower of gold which descended upon Danae; that this gold has a *fructifying* effect may be only a secondary consideration, but is still worth our attention. At all events the word itself occurs favourably early. In explanation of Isidoros' use of the epithet of the Nile Rostovtzeff [2] remarked that 'the cult of the Nile was very popular with the Greeks of Egypt'. The respect paid to the Nile and its god through hymns from Pharaonic times onward needs no proof, and to see how tenacious was the imagery of the Nile one has only to compare the material collected by A. Hermann in *Jb. f. Antike u. Christentum* 2 (1959), particularly at pp. 65 ff. for the representations in art. I suggest therefore that the association which was later to be the basis of Prokopios' playful request to Hieronymos, luxuriating in Egypt (γέλα μόνον χρυσῷ ῥέοντα τὸν Νεῖλον ὁρῶν) [3], was already made in Hellenistic times and had been justified, not as with other rivers by their alluvial gold, but by the precious, uniquely precious, silt of the Nile.

Of course it would have been an advantage to have found a similar title in existence, a similar play, in Pharaonic times. Dr. Alfred Hermann of the Franz Joseph Dölger-Institut at Bonn has kindly expressed to me by letter his doubts that the *topos* could be traced back to Pharaonic Egypt, and has suggested that it owes something to the χρυσοῦν θέρος of, say, Metapontum, drawing my attention to Paul Wolters' article, 'Gestalt und Sinn der Ahre in antiker Kunst', *Die Antike* 6 (1930), 284-301. Dr. B. H. Stricker of the State Museum of Antiquities at Leiden issued a friendly warning that for Egypt the question is complicated, and the symbolism of gold not yet clearly grasped [4]; cosmic speculations may well be

1 *Ap.* Athen. VIII. 345 a.

2 *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* III p. 1419 n. 206.

3 *Epist.* 26 (= Hercher, *Epistologr. Gr.*, p. 541). This example was mentioned by W. Headlam at Herodas I. 29 (p. 27).

4 He referred me to F. Daumas, 'La valeur de l'or dans la pensée égyp-

at the root of the matter. But at the same time he drew my attention to A. Erman-H. Grapow, *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache* (Leipzig 1926-31), II. 240 nn. 8-10, where *nb*, properly 'gold', is used for 'corn', especially in relation to the Osiris mysteries.

Certainly it is unobjectionable that such a *topos* should involve such a river, inasmuch as Egypt is the 'gift of the Nile' [1], and there is one further association which would make the equation 'corn = gold' reasonable for a Greek. Wealth in produce preceded wealth in money. This is reflected in Greek terminology as much as in Latin, although we do not find anything with as tidy an etymology as *pecunia*. Zenodoros in his τὰ περὶ συνηθείας [2] defines ἄφενος as ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν προσποριζομένων καρπῶν πλοῦτος. More significant is Hesychios' note [3] on the poetic phrase εὔπλουτον κανοῦν (= Steffen, *Satyr. gr. frag.*², p. 266, Incert. poet. frag. 25) εὖ ἔχον πλούτου, διὰ τὰς ἐπ' αὐτῷ ὀλάς. πλοῦτον γὰρ ἔλεγον τὴν ἐκ τῶν κριθῶν καὶ τῶν πυρῶν περιουσίαν. Now this invites comparison not only with Ploutos as the son of Demeter in Greek mythology [4], but also with a line of poetry preserved by Cornutus (*N.D.* 28): σίτου καὶ κριθῆς, ὦ νήπιε, πλοῦτος ἄριστος. [5] R. Strömberg [6] regards Hesychios' explanation of εὔπλουτον κανοῦν as based on the verse cited by Cornutus, which seems to me unlikely in the extreme; but the way in which the passages reinforce one another does suggest that the association of wealth and corn was not infrequent. I therefore suggest that the association of gold and corn seems only a particular application of the foregoing idea. And it is at least a little odd, if this association occurs in Kallimachos, that εὔπλουτον κανοῦν 'a basket rich in *wealth*' = *olai* should provide so close a parallel to '*likna* full of *gold*' = corn.

If there were a *topos* featuring corn as 'gold' [7], which would

---

tienne', *Rev. hist. religions* 149 (1956), 1-17 and B. Celada, *Sefarad* 16 (1956), 462 f. The former emphasizes 'la valeur vivificatrice de l'or' (comparing *p' p'* with its two meanings of 'luire' and 'mettre au monde'), but does not touch on our specific problem.

[1] Hdt. 2. 5.

[2] E. Miller, *Mél. de litt. gr.*, p. 409; cf. Eust. *ad Od.* 1. 27.

[3] Cf. s.v. πλοῦτος· ἡ τῶν σπερμάτων ἐπικαρπία καὶ ἡ πανσπερμία.

[4] See Nilsson, *Gesch. d. gr. Religion*, I pp. 121, 849.

[5] It recurs in a garbled form in Schol. Hes. *Theog.* 971 πόαων καὶ κριθῶν, ὦ νήπιε Πλοῦτε.

[6] *Greek Proverbs*, p. 92.

[7] Prof. C. del Grande, *Filologia Minore* (1956), p. 243, pulisbhed a view which partly coincides with mine, but leaves the syntax obscure: 'Quell'

provide the natural contents for the *likna*, then πασσαίμεσθα 'may we eat' becomes highly significant. At the moment of recital the listener could do no more than question whether he had heard aright; surely a mispronunciation, surely πᾶσαίμεσθα! But then he should ask himself whether it was merely the technique of *variatio* that led the poet to use an aorist optative, when πᾶσεύμεσθα would have been consistent with the previous futures. I really doubt whether he could find satisfaction in assuming an intentional difference in sense, as Cahen [1] has done by invoking 'la nuance du *voeu*'; the confident note struck in the two previous articles of faith does not encourage us to believe that his characters will modify their optimism. But it is significant that the aorist optative is used, if it comes from a verb whose future was unmetrical, πᾶσεύμεσθα.

In retrospect, when the text has been read or the author has been challenged, it would be recognized that πασσαίμεσθα mischievously demanded a re-evaluation of the '*likna* full of gold'—an effective means of guaranteeing that the moving preceding lines, with their powerful picture of the simple faith of the worshippers at the *Thesmophoria*, are a literary exercise rather than the evidence of the impression that such piety had made on the poet. But there is another consequence if I am right. Since the *topos* would involve the Nile, its use here would show unequivocally that the poet's geographical interests for the poem do not lie outside Egypt. It was once alleged—and the idea has since been repeated—that Alexandria is excluded as the locale because 'man sollte auch meinen, dass in Alexandreia ein Gebet für den König nicht fehlen würde' [2]. The ease with which judgments such as this have been made, although they rob the poet of all initiative, suggests that it has seldom been asked whether the absence of an item, which we——with varying degrees of justification—expect, is principally due to a plan which imposes prior obligations on the poet. So it is here; locale is of so little importance for the structural significance of the hymn, that, even if the *topos* does point to Egypt, Kallimachos does not enlarge upon the idea.

H. 6 *and Epicharmos*

If H. 6 is comedy, then comedy in a Doric tonality should

«oro» di grani e spighe spiega il πασεύμεσθα; ma, a mantenere il valore generale della dizione, varrebbe «godremo», come dai piú vien tradotto'.

[1] *Comm.*, p. 127.

[2] Wilamowitz, *Hell. Dicht.*, II p. 29.

suggest above all Epicharmos as a formal model. I have presented this viewpoint in *The Poet at Play*, pp. 117-123, outlining the role played by mythological burlesque in what survives, and have been sanguine enough to hold that the parallelism between Hs. 5 and 6 favours our seeing a specific Dorian influence in the former composition, Threnodic Elegy. The basis of this belief is a conclusion that the dialect in H. 5 is *functional* [1], preserves a nuance of this character in H. 6. 1-17 but largely loses phonetic significance for the rest of the poem. The change of mood in H. 6 therefore calls for an intellectual justification of the preservation of a literary Doric, the more so as the elegiac couplet, which allows delicate and plaintive effects in H. 5, is not further used. If Kallimachos *uses* the phonetic advantages of Doric in H. 5, the parallelism of these two hymns will not make 'simple *variatio*' a very satisfying answer.

By the 'leg-pull' at H. 6. 17, as I see it, the poet changes from Doric Threnody to Doric Comedy. That the existence of a highly developed Dorian farce at an early date has now taken a severe beating from L. Breitholtz [2] will not affect my argument. But from a very respected quarter I have received some opposition to the idea that Kallimachos would be likely to cite Epicharmos as his justification for the appropriateness of the Doric dialect for his treatment of Erysichthon. If the *onus probandi* rests with me, I am still unconvinced that there is anything inherently improbable in my suggestion.

For us Doric comedy is virtually synonymous with Epicharmos because of our fragmentary knowledge. But the same association was as easy for a Hellenist because of literary doctrine. Plato already accorded Epicharmos a sort of pre-eminence in comedy [3]; Aristotle [4] was aware that the Sicilian Megarians claimed the invention of comedy because the poet was of their country. When then we find the same statement in a rather significant place, Theokritos Epigr. 18. 1 f., it will not do to attribute it solely to Sicilian pride: Ἅ τε φωνὰ Δώριος χὡνὴρ ὁ τὰν κωμῳδίαν/εὑρὼν

[1] *PaP*, pp. 82-87.

[2] *Die dorische Farce im griechischen Mutterland vor dem 5. Jahrhundert, Hypothese oder Realität?* (Stockholm 1960). Cf. T. B. L. Webster, *Gnomon* 33 (1961), 452 ff.

[3] *Theaet.* 152e (καὶ τῶν ποιητῶν οἱ ἄκροι τῆς ποιήσεως ἑκατέρας, κωμῳδίας μὲν Ἐπίχαρμος, τραγῳδίας δὲ Ὅμηρος).

[4] *Poet.* 1448 a 29 ff.

'Επίχαρμος [1]. After him the statement is not uncommon [2]. Epicharmos, therefore, would seem an obvious choice.

It is obvious that from line 17 H. 6 changes course. If the poet could not justify this change, then there is a serious breach in the unity of his composition. Few admirers of cameos will buy one with a prominent split, and Kallimachos' age was no less critical. In consequence he has chosen just that moment in the *Thesmophoria* when a change of mood is natural, and the charge of disunity must be dismissed. But the mood which is no longer possible is the mood of H. 5, and the use of dialect is an integral part of that. No one would ever suggest that the composition could reasonably change its dialect after line 17, but it is still a pertinent academic question as to why the Doric dialect retains its appropriateness in the new circumstances. Doric comedy, and that essentially the comedy of Epicharmos, seems to me the only possible answer.

Conclusion: The Future of Studies in Mischief

I have had occasion to say more than once that Kallimachos is a poet who invites us to take something for granted—a word, an idea, even a mood. I suspect that we fall into such traps rather more easily than his Hellenistic circle, for we are trained to the idea that ambiguity is a textual problem. A sounder reading or more detailed knowledge of syntax or usage, we say, will eliminate the problem. We are, moreover, so conscious of our handicaps, especially for establishing normal usage, that we regard it as a sign of weakness for many kinds of literature if a commentator suggests that two quite different ideas may simultaneously have a part to play. It is also unfortunate that W. B. Stanford's *Ambiguity in Greek Literature*, while illustrating the Greek willingness at various levels to play a double game, went no further than Aristotle, omitting the very age in which verbal plays became an end in themselves. In Kallimachos, however, it should be noted how often they are functional, subordinated to a careful plan.

---

[1] The turn of phrase seems to reflect a pose of the epigrammatist rather than the simple needs of his subject. If this is a way of saying 'I write in Doric because it was Epicharmos' dialect', he would say the same as Kallimachos.

[2] Bywater *ad* Arist. *loc cit.* mentions Solinus 5. 13, Themistius *Or.* 27, 406 Dindorf, Prol. de Comoedia 3 = Kaibel *C.G.F.* 1 p. 7, Suda *s.v.* 'Επίχαρμος.

I do not expect that he was merely *primus inter pares*, but it would be worth the effort to look for deliberate ambiguity elsewhere in Hellenistic literature. Theokritos' Seventh Idyll comes most readily to my mind. On line 24 (ἦ μετὰ δαῖτ' ἄκλητος ἐπείγεαι . . .;) Gow provides the sanest of notes, illustrating the fact that both δαῖτ' ἄκλητος and δαῖτα κλητός will give reasonable sense. But what deters me from dividing ΔΑΙΤΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ is that winning smile of Lykidas, so attractively drawn by Theokritos-Simichidas at 19 f., 42 and 128. This identifying characteristic makes the 'goatherd' the literary figure of flesh and blood that assuredly he is, and invites us to speculate whether his banter is a little more carefully constructed than we have supposed. When the Son of the Wolf further asks ἦ τινος ἀστῶν/λανὸν ἔπι θρῴσκεις; is the idea simply 'cours-tu au pressoir' (Legrand) or is θρῴσκειν used of hostile intent [1]? Can the question be divorced from our attitude to the earlier clause? If this 'double talk' should ever prove to be no figment of my imagination, it would not necessarily provide belated support for Gercke's idea that Lykidas is Kallimachos, for amid the activities of the Hellenistic coterie mischief must often have been the fairer face of malice.

Recently K. F. Quinn [2] published a timely reminder of the high status of plays upon ambiguity.

> 'Now, there are situations even in prose where we actually gain something by being less clear, while in poetry it is widely recognized that ambiguity may enable us to convey to a sympathetic reader things worth his understanding which we might not easily bring him to understand by unambiguous statements, however full. Roman poetry in the Augustan age went a step further: not content to accept the contribution to poetic richness of an ambiguity that was the occasional accidental consequence of a style more compact, more intense, than that of prose, the Augustan poets clearly went out of their way to devise ambiguities for ambiguity's sake—or rather in order to increase through ambiguity the power their poetry exercised on the reader.'

If this is true of Roman poetry, it is truer of Greek. The richness of the language and its long literary history made for clarity in prose, obscurity in verse, above all in types of poetry which, by evoking the shades of a linguistic past, awoke dormant Ambiguity as well. The freedom with which writers in hexametric verse could,

[1] See Gow *ad* Theocr. 7. 25.
[2] 'Syntactical Ambiguity in Horace and Vergil', *Aumla* (Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association) 14 (1960), 36-46. The passage cited is on p. 37.

for example, avail themselves of prepositions, of κε, or not, thereby accentuating the problem of case syncretism or the various functions of the optative, threatens to become sheer licence in an age which found positive delight in its eclecticism. Homeric commentators (and with them the third century abounded) may reasonably be thought to be badly handicapped should they aspire to clarity of expression in their own hexameters, and it should not surprise if a kind of linguistic morbidity took its place.

It has often been found that mischief goes hand in hand with Kallimachos' motivation of the action. The problem of H. 3 is precisely that, despite the appeal of a purple patch or two, the composition rambles; it seems more loosely constructed than any other poem onto which we have fastened the convenient title of *epyllion* and stands out strikingly from the careful composition of at least Hymns 2, 4, 5 and 6. It may be that H. 3 is rather closer to H. 1 in chronology than to H. 4, with which it is usually connected; but there still may be a *Gesichtspunkt* that defies detection. In such a situation those who can accept the new dimension to Kallimachos' mischief will perhaps find it most rewarding to look for signs of motivation. I choose lines 66-79 because they deserve closer scrutiny, not because I can supply the answers.

To scare her children into obedience a divine mother calls upon the Cyclopes, Arges *or* Steropes. Had Kallimachos said 'and', it would be natural to find only poetic licence in the absence of Brontes, but 'or' introduces the idea of selection. Perhaps we should wonder what has happened to the other member of what had already been presented by Hesiod as a trio. And then, answering the opening μήτηρ μὲν, comes ὁ δέ. Ah, perhaps we shall meet him now. But no, it turns out to be Hermes covered with black ash, dressing up 'for the children' like a reluctant English butler. As long as it was felt that the Cyclopes lived too far away to be able to answer the summons, and consequently Hermes is a make-believe Cyclops, pressed into service to add substance to a mother's threats, the question of motivation could hardly arise. But at lines 64-5 Kallimachos is quite explicit when he says that 'even daughters of the gods who have passed their baby years never see them without a shudder'. In this world, then, Lipara is not as remote from Olympus as we may imagine and, whether Hermes is merely a reinforcement or substitutes for *one* of the Cyclopes, it is unnatural to maintain that he must take the place of all of them.

We have been told that Artemis' attendants could not bear the sight of the Cyclopes when the goddess visited them to place an order for her weapons. Now Kallimachos explains Artemis' own unconcern, for when she was three she had visited them; *Brontes* had seated her on his knee and the divine child had proceeded to wrench the hair from his chest:

τὸ δ' ἄτριχον εἰσέτι καὶ νῦν
μεσσάτιον στέρνοιο μένει μέρος, ὡς ὅτε κόρσῃ
φωτὸς ἐνιδρυθεῖσα κόμην ἐπενείματ' ἀλώπηξ (77-9).

Surely we can now see why Brontes is not summoned as bogey; he is rather ridiculous with his present deformity. The Cyclopes, we may imagine, are busy people. At lines 49-50, with a delicate sense of timing in the arrangement of the words and a refreshing disregard for the sanctity of the commonplace, the poet has them engaged upon a mighty work, a horse-trough for Poseidon; Apollonios of Rhodes (I. 730 f.) provides the Cyclopes with more dignified labours, the forging of bolts of lightning for Zeus [1]. If it is therefore unrealistic for a divine mother to expect them all to come, and she has to choose, it had better not be Brontes.

This sequence of ideas would be complete in itself, but for the presence of εἰσέτι καὶ νῦν. This is a turn of phrase which should surprise; there must be something still to say. The phrase suggests aitiology, but surely no previous writer had mentioned Brontes' hairlessness. It may be deliberately overdrawn, as if to say 'And should you chance to pass him in the street, you'll observe that I am right'; it may also be Kallimachos playing the role of a confidant of the gods who has kept abreast of divine affairs. But εἰσέτι καὶ νῦν may as easily point to a merger of mythology and contemporary affairs. Was there an opponent with a skin disease? We might then find significance in the fact that Kallimachos had

[1] In all probability Apollonios does not draw on Kallimachos here (despite E. Eichgrün, *Kallimachos und Apollonios Rhodios*, Diss. Free Univ. Berlin 1961, pp. 115 f.). Both remember *Il.* 18. 369 ff., where Hephaistos is busily constructing his famous wheeled tripods, but Apollonios was not the first to have smiths engaged upon such serious undertakings; the Cyclopes are responsible for Zeus' bolts of lightning at Eur. *Alc.* 5. Cf. Hes. *Theog.* 501-5 with Apollod. I. ii. 1 and Hes. *Theog.* 141 (generally regarded as an intruded line, but it may still be ancient). Kallimachos parodies the grand style, but he reproduces it in H. 4. 31, where the Telchines forge Poseidon's trident. It is unlikely that Apollonios would base a piece of serious writing upon a parody without making his attitude to the Callimachean passage plain.

chosen Brontes, rather than Arges, as his mask, for in the usage of lines 68 and 75 the names are interchangeable. 'The Thunderer' is as good a description of a cyclic poet as any, from the poet who declares in the prologue to the *Aitia*: βροντᾶν δ' οὐκ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ Διός.

If this answer has any chance of being right we are, of course, in trouble, for only a *Spottepigramm* or writer of scurrilous personalia would take us further in our quest. But at the same time there is Artemis herself; is she, according to a discredited interpretation, a member of the royal family? Here as much depends on chronology as on anything else, for if Kallimachos had already played upon Philadelphos as Apollo (as I shall later attempt to show that he does), then Artemis as Apollo's sister may be presumed to have a special part to play. These are at least considerations which deserve an airing. The frontispiece of Spanheim's edition of Kallimachos [1] shows Kallimachos sacrificing to the Olympian gods. It is possible to construe his expression as a smile. The smile should be very broad indeed.

[1] Published at Utrecht in 1697. The plate is also used in the Ernesti edition (Leiden 1761).